

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26396 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-204 Year-2023 Thana- JANKINAGAR District- Purnia

Pawan Kumar S/o Damodar Prasad Yadav R/o vill - Gulela Vittha Ladugarh,  
ward no. 11, P.S. - Janki Nagar, Dist. - Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s  
Versus  
The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**  
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bhola Prasad, Adv.  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR  
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

3      29-07-2024                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in a case instituted  
for the offence under Sections 341, 323, 363, 365, 504/34 of the  
Indian Penal Code, registered in connection with Jankinagar P.S.  
Case No. 204 of 2023.

3. As per prosecution case, the grand-daughter of the  
informant was solemnized marriage with the petitioner and after  
some days of marriage all the F.I.R. named accused persons



including the petitioner started assaulting and abusing with her for non-fulfillment of dowry demand and also threatened to kill her. It is further alleged that grand-daughter of the informant informed this incident to him, thereafter he reached at her house and saw that the door was locked and all the family members were not there then he claimed that the accused persons have disappeared his grand-daughter.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He has committed no offence. Petitioner is the husband of the victim. There is no specific allegation against the petitioner and on the basis of suspicion, implicated in this case. Petitioner is in custody since 30.11.2023.

5. Learned APP for the State has opposed the application for bail and submitted that Petitioner is named in the FIR. He submitted that the victim is still traceless. Petitioner is the husband of the victim and the sole responsibility of taking care his wife (victim) is against the petitioner but he did not do so. The tower location of the petitioner's mobile was to different place of different district on the same date creates reasonable doubt regarding involvement of the petitioner which has come in para-55 of the case diary. During investigation several witnesses have also supported the prosecution case.



6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the seriousness of the case, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands **rejected**.

**(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)**

Arish/-

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

