

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.626 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-44 Year-2021 Thana- CHANDRADIP District- Jamui

=====

Sujit Kumar S/o Rajendra Singh R/o village- Sagma, P.S.- Chandradip,
District- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Niranjan Parihar

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Gulnar begum

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 12-01-2023 Heard Ld. counsel for the petitioner and Ld. APP

for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with

Chandradip P.S. Case No. 44 of 2021, registered for the

offences punishable under Sections 304(B) and 34 of the

Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case as emerges from the F.I.R. is

that the marriage of the informant's daughter, namely, Baby

Kumari was solemnized with one Sujit Kumar, according to

Hindu rites and customs. After some times, the husband and

his family members started torturing her for non-fulfillment

of illegal demand of dowry and ultimately they killed her



Ld. counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that the alleged victim has died due to Corona. He also submits that investigation in this case is complete and charge-sheet has already been submitted.

He further submits that the petitioner has been languishing in jail since 05.07.2021.

It has also been stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one.

However, Ld. APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the petitioner for bail submitting that the accused petitioner is husband of the alleged victim who has suffered dowry death at the hands of the accused persons. He further submits that as per medico-legal report, she has been strangled.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, particularly the nature of the alleged offence and the material



on record, I am not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. As such, there is no infirmities in the impugned order.

This petition is accordingly dismissed.

However, Ld. Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial. In case, the trial is not concluded within a period of one year, the petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

Ld. counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove all the defects, if any, pointed out by the office within a period of one month and the Registry is directed to issue the certified copy of this order only after removal of office objections.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

uttam/-

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

