

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53889 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-388 Year-2020 Thana- KOTWA District- East Champaran

ARVIND OJHA @ MONU OJHA @ ARBIND JHA @ MANU JHA Son of
Bhola Ojha Resident of Village - Maharani Bairiya, P.s.- Kotwa, Distt.- East
Champaran. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sangeet Deokuliar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

6 12-04-2023 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well
as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in connection
with Kotwa P.S. Case No. 388 of 2020/G.R. Case No. 8380 of
2020, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302,
201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The informant Ganesh Singh is father of the deceased
Puja Devi. As per allegation, his daughter was married to the
petitioner in the year 2012. The accused persons subjected her to
cruelty for demand of dowry. They made a pressure upon the
informant to fulfill the demand, after disposing of his landed
property. The accused persons used to torture the deceased for
non-fulfillment of their demand. At about 5:00 pm, on
12.11.2020, the informant came to know that all the accused
persons, named in the FIR, including the petitioner, were
cremating the dead body, after killing the deceased in a nearby



field. The informant rushed to the place of occurrence and saw the burning dead body of his daughter.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though the petitioner is husband but he is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. As a matter of fact, there was no good relation between the informant and his daughter (deceased) and it was reason that she was brought up in her maternal house. He has submitted further that the informant was even not present at the occasion of marriage of his daughter.

On the other hand, learned APP has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that it has been detected during course of investigation that the informant had transferred two and half bigha of land in favour of his brother's daughter-in-law and due to that, the petitioner had a vendetta against the informant and wife as well. He has also submitted that the witnesses in paragraph nos. 20 and 21 have also supported the occurrence. The investigation is going on.

In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privileges for bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/Kundan

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

