

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60948 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-180 Year-2022 Thana- BELHAR District- Banka

=====

Ravi Tanti S/o Aghunu Tanti R/V- Bara, P.S.- Belhar, Distt-Banka.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Praveen Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Suresh Prasad Singh, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      22-02-2023                      Let the defect(s), if any, be removed within two weeks  
from today.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with  
Belhar P.S. Case No. 180 of 2022 lodged under Sections 302, 34  
of the I.P.C.

As per the prosecution case, the F.I.R. has been  
lodged against 3 known persons alleging that the informant  
whose marriage was solemnized with the deceased 10 years  
back having 3 children from the said wedlock had burnt his wife  
by pouring kerosene oil after hatching a conspiracy.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from  
the contents of the F.I.R., it is admitted that the marital life of  
the petitioner was happy and it is due to this reason, they have 3  
children, all are minor at present. Counsel further submits that

under an unfortunate accident, this event took place. He submits that from the order passed by the Additional & Sessions Judge, Banka, the cause of death was shown asphyxial death caused by flame of burn injury which could not be made by pouring kerosene oil. Counsel further submit on social aspect that all the 3 children of the petitioner are still residing at the petitioner's house and no one is there to take care of them. He submits that the antecedent of the petitioner is clean and he is in custody since 14.07.2022.

Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that if bail shall be granted, he shall start delaying in framing of charge and make delay in trial.

In the present facts and circumstances of this case and the submissions made above, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present but liberty is granted to him that he may renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge and upon framing of charge, the Trial Court is directed to release him on bail imposing its own conditions, so that he may not evade his appearance during trial.

With this observation, the bail application stands rejected.

**(Dr. Anshuman, J.)**

sadique/-

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