

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20213 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-716 Year-2023 Thana- BIHTA District- Patna

Rajesh Kumar SON OF SRI MEGHANATH SINGH @ RAGHUNATH SINGH @ RAGHUNATH SINGH Resident of village -Dihari Ps -Bihta District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar BIHAR
2. The State Of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Kamal Kishore Singh
For the State	:	Mr.Shailendra Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr.Sanjay Kumar Pandey No. 5

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

4 01-07-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned APP for the State.

2. In this case, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in connection with Bihta P.S. Case No. 716 of 2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304(B), 201, 34 of the IPC.

3. As per allegation, the marriage of daughter of the informant was solemnized with the petitioner in the year 2019. After marriage, the petitioner along with his family members started torturing her for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry. On 13.07.2023, the informant tried to contact with her daughter, but her mobile phone was switched off. Further, the informant along with his family members reached her matrimonial house where he



came to know that her daughter was killed by her husband and his family members.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is a person of clean antecedent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The deceased herself committed suicide. He has submitted further that as per statement of driver of the ambulance, the deceased was alive when she was being shifted to the PMCH.

5. On the other hand, Mr. Shailendra Kumar, the learned APP for the State and the learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the dead body was cremated stealthily without transmitting information to the native members of the deceased. There is specific allegation against the petitioner in the FIR of demand of dowry. Soon before death of the deceased, the petitioner and his family members tortured the victim for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry. It has also been mentioned in the FIR that on earlier occasion also, she was assaulted by the petitioner for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry. They have submitted further that the father of the petitioner is a Police Officer and he was trying to interfere with the investigation and on the complaint made on behalf of the informant, disciplinary proceeding was initiated against the investigating officer.

6. From perusal of the evidences collected during the



course of investigation, it appears that the witnesses have supported the occurrence. It has not been clarified as to why before cremation, the family members of the deceased were not informed. The cumulative study of the evidences shows that the deceased was done to death within seven years of her marriage under unnatural circumstances and soon before death, she was tortured for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry.

7. In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

kundan/-

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

