

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37632 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-166 Year-2022 Thana- Mehendiya District- Arwal

=====

Swati Kumari DAUGHTER OF VIRENDRA YADAV VILLAGE- JAYPUR,
PS- MEHANDIYA, DIST- ARWAL

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Lakshmindra Kumar Yadav

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Madhuri Lata

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 03-07-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.
2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out of Mehendiya Police Station Case No. 166 of 2022, disclosing offences under Sections 304(B), 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. As per the prosecution story, informant's daughter/deceased was married with Bablu Yadav in the year 2020 as per Hindu rites and customs and after marriage, her in laws including her husband began to torture the daughter of the informant for dowry and on non-fulfillment of the said demand, they began to assault and torture the daughter of the informant. Further, the informant has alleged that accused namely Gita Devi (mother-in-law), Virendra Yadav (father-in-law) and



Swati Kumari (sister-in-law) killed the daughter of the informant by pressing her neck.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is unmarried younger sister-in-law (nanad) of the deceased Amrita Kumari and has falsely been implicated in the present case based on false and concocted story. He further submits that petitioner has neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the deceased/Amrita Kumari. He next submits that the petitioner has been made accused merely on the basis of suspicion.
5. Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the offence and the specific allegation in the FIR that the petitioner, along with other FIR named accused, killed the daughter of the informant for dowry within two years of marriage, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.
6. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

