

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74982 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-293 Year-2023 Thana- KESARIA District- East Champaran

1. RAMA MAHTO S/O LATE TOKHAN MAHTO VILLAGE-
SUNDRAPUR MALAHI TOLA, WARD NO. 14, PS. KESARIYA, DIST.
EAST CHAMPARAN
2. DHANESHA DEVI W/O RAMA MAHTO VILLAGE- SUNDRAPUR
MALAHI TOLA, WARD NO. 14, PS. KESARIYA, DIST. EAST
CHAMPARAN

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Karandeep Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Navin Kumar Pandey, APP
	Mr.Rajesh Ranjan, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 04-12-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel
for the informant and learned APP for the State.

2. Petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection
with Kesariya P.S. Case No.293 of 2023, registered for the
offence punishable u/s 304(B) and 120(B) of the IPC.

3. As per the F.I.R., the daughter of the informant has been
killed in her matrimonial house due to non-fulfillment of dowry
demand.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that
petitioners are quite innocent and have not committed any
offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case due to



ulterior motive. It is submitted that petitioner no.1 is the father-in-law and petitioner no.2 is the mother-in-law of the deceased and they have never made any dowry demand and their son used to live separately from the petitioners. There is no specific overt act against the petitioners. Petitioners have no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that there is specific allegation against the petitioners and the daughter of the informant has been killed within one month of marriage in the matrimonial house.

6. Considering the nature of allegation and the fact that the deceased has died within one month of marriage in the matrimonial house, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on their behalf is hereby rejected.

7. This application is accordingly dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

pallavi/-

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

