

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.41391 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-283 Year-2023 Thana- KHUSRUPUR District- Patna

=====

Anuj @ Chhotu Paswan SON OF SUDHIR PASWAN Resident of Village -
Baikathpur, PS- Khushrupur, Dist- patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raj Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 20-08-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 304(B) of
the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that his daughter was married to the petitioner on
12.05.2023, and after marriage, the petitioner was demanding a
motorcycle and on account of non-fulfillment of the demand,
the daughter of the informant was killed.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case
being the husband. It is next submitted that the petitioner was
not even present at the place of occurrence, when his wife



committed suicide. It is also submitted that allegation of demand of dowry is general and omnibus in nature.

5. The learned APP Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the allegation, as alleged in the F.I.R., it would manifest that the deceased was married to the petitioner on 12.05.2023 and she died on 05.07.2023, as such, the death was within two months of the marriage, hence, presumption in law, for the present, is against the petitioner. It is also submitted that even presuming what has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is true, in that event also, the presumption would be that petitioner created conditions conducive which led the deceased to take her life.

6. In view of the submission made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

