

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53663 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-160 Year-2020 Thana- HISUWA District- Nawada

RABINDRA YADAV Son of Ramashis Prasad Yadav R/V- Ranipur, P.S-
Hisua, Dist- Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shivnandan Bharti, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Amit Kumar Rakesh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 27-02-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offence under Sections 304B, 120B, 201/34 of the Indian Penal
Code.

The sister of the informant is subjected to torture and
assault and she has been done to death by the accused persons
including the petitioner on account of non-fulfillment of demand
of dowry.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits
that the petitioner, who is of clean antecedent, is innocent and
has falsely been implicated in this case. In fact, the petitioner
happens to be husband of the deceased and he has never
demanded any dowry nor he has assaulted the deceased in any



manner. He further submits that according to the F.I.R. the petitioner along with his family members has killed the deceased and her dead body has been disposed of by setting her on fire. He further submits that there is no eye witness to the alleged occurrence. The petitioner is rotting in judicial custody since 25.05.2022.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is husband of the deceased and he has actively participated in commission of murder of the deceased on account of non fulfillment of demand of dowry of rupees one lakh and cremated the dead body of the deceased setting her on fire. He further submits that several witnesses have supported the prosecution version which could be evident from paragraphs 2,3,4,8,9,10 and 11 of the case diary. Hence, the petitioner does deserve to be enlarged on bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of offence, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

brajesh/-

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

