

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28945 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-200 Year-2023 Thana- JALALGARH District- Purnia

Lallan Yadav Son of Late Sitaram Yadav Resident of - Rambagh Chowk, P.S.-
Sadar, District- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Y.V. Giri, Sr. Adv.
: Mr.Devashish Giri, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Aslam Ansari
For the Informant : Mr. Umesh Kumar Gupta, Adv.
: Mr. Vijay Kishore Bharti, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 26-06-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Jalalgarh P.S. Case No.200 of 2023 lodged under Sections 302
and 34 of the I.P.C. read with Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the F.I.R. has been
lodged against seven named accused persons including the
petitioner and informant has alleged that the marriage of his
daughter was solemnized with the petitioner and in lieu of land,
he used to torture his daughter and also make demand of dowry
and subsequently, killed his daughter.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits
that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He
submits that from the contents of F.I.R., it become clear that
death of informant' daughter has been communicated by the
petitioner himself to the informant.



5. Counsel further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 20.10.2023 having clean antecedent. He submits that charge-sheet has already been filed in this case and charge has also been framed.

6. Counsel further submits that case diary has been called for. From the case diary, it has come in paragraph 18 that independent witness has narrated the entire fact which he has seen and interaction took place between the petitioner and independent witness at nearby place of occurrence.

7. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail.

8. Learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the petitioner is completely responsible for the death of the informant's daughter. He submits that in paragraph 18 of the case diary, independent witness has disclosed that the petitioner and his wife were working in Delhi and they have a juice shop in Delhi. The deceased (informant's daughter) was also in job in Delhi and during covid-19 lockdown, they have returned back and purchased a land in her name whereas the petitioner was started cold drink agency. The dispute started between the husband and wife with a view to enter the name in the land record due to this reason scuffling used to take place. In this regard, *panchayati*



was also taken place, but there was no change in the behavior of the petitioner.

9. Counsel further submits that from the materials which come from the mouth of the independent witness during further investigation that there is extreme motive against the petitioner that he has committed the said offence.

10. In the present facts and circumstances of this case and the submissions made above, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

11. However, liberty is hereby granted to the petitioner that he may renew his prayer for bail 6 months from today. In the meantime, trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude it.

12. Counsel for the informant is also directed to support in the evidence.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Prakashmani/-

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

