

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47513 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-52 Year-2021 Thana- PARIHAR District- Sitamarhi

=====

CHHOTU PASWAN @ CHHOTY PASWAN SON OF LATE GANGA
PRASAD RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- SAUTINIYA WARD NO. 15, P.S.-
PARIHAR, DISTRICT- SITAMARHI

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pratik Mishra

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Murli Dhar

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

- 2 04-08-2023
1. Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to remove defect (s), as pointed out by the office, if any, within a period of four weeks on resumption of physical mode.
 2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.
 3. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Parihar P.S. Case No. 52 of 2021 dated 06.03.2021 registered for the offences punishable u/ss 304(B), 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
 4. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner and the co-accused persons are alleged to have committed murder of the



daughter of the informant due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry and her body was burnt.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner is the husband of the deceased and he neither tortured nor demanded any kind of dowry. It is further submitted that the petitioner was working as labourer in Chennai at the relevant date and time of occurrence. The petitioner has got clean antecedent as stated in para-3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is in custody since 19.04.2023.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the bail petition of the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner was married to Devta Devi in the year 2019. There is specific allegation of demand of dowry of Rs. 50,000/ One lac as dowry from the deceased's brother. The petitioner did not file any paper showing that he was in Chennai at the relevant date and time of occurrence. The investigation is pending against the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the heinous nature of allegation against the petitioner and finding no merit in the contention of learned



counsel for the petitioner, I'm not inclined to enlarge the
petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the application stands rejected.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Alok Verma/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

