

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55126 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-77 Year-2022 Thana- MAJORGANJ District- Sitamarhi

Radhakant Singh @ Radhekant Singh Son of Late Ramdeo Singh Resident of Village  
- Dumrikala, P.S.- Majorganj, District - Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance:**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Birendra Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      18-03-2023              Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned APP  
for the State.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Majorganj P.S.  
Case No. 77 of 2022 registered for the offence punishable under  
Section 304(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per the prosecution, the informant's sister (deceased) was  
subjected to physical torture and later the victim was set ablaze by  
this petitioner and other co-accused persons over non-fulfillment of  
dowry demand.

The main submissions advanced by learned counsel for  
petitioner are that the petitioner is father-in-law of the deceased,  
against him there is no specific allegation and he has been  
languishing in jail since 28.06.2022 and petitioner is separate in mess  
and in all other affairs from the husband of the deceased.

Learned APP for the State has opposed the bail prayer.

Heard both the sides and perused the FIR, case diary and *post-*

*mortem* report of the deceased. Admittedly, the victim who happened to be daughter-in-law of this petitioner died within five years of her marriage by sustaining burn injuries and her death took place in the house of her in-laws and as per the informant this petitioner and his other family members always tortured the victim for demand of five lakh rupees and a motorcycle and finally they set her on fire and the allegation of causing burn injury to the victim gets support from the *post-mortem* report of the deceased and the most important fact is that the statements of two material witnesses mentioned in paragraph no. 6 and 7 of the case diary supported the allegation of the prosecution and both the said witnesses are neighbours of the petitioner and after the commission of the alleged occurrence this petitioner and other co-accused persons were found absconding from their house. In view of the above facts and circumstances appearing against the petitioner as well as considering the seriousness of the allegation, in my opinion it is not a fit case for bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, his bail prayer stands rejected.

The petitioner may renew his bail prayer after six months from the date of this order if any significant progress is not made in his trial in the said period.

**(Shailendra Singh, J)**

Shahnawaz/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|