

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.54350 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-88 Year-2024 Thana- KATEYA District- Gopalganj

Urmila Devi Wife of Suresh Ram Resident of Vill- Jamunaha, P.S.- Kateya,
District- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satyeshwar Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nawal Kishore Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 31-08-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.
2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail,
arises out of Kateya PS case no. 88 of 2024, disclosing offences
punishable under Section 304(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. The prosecution story, as per the First Information
Report, is that the informant's daughter Sunita Kumari was
married with co-accused Dilip Ram on 09.06.2023. After
sometime, the accused persons started demanding golden chain,
refrigerator and washing machine as dowry and due to
non-fulfilment of the demand, on 14.03.2024, informant's
daughter was killed. When the informant went to sasural of his
daughter, none of the accused persons were present there. The
post-mortem of the body was conducted by the police.
4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner is mother-in-law of the deceased and has falsely been implicated in this case on the basis of general and omnibus allegation. The husband of the deceased was arrested on 15.03.2024. Learned counsel further submits that the death is suicidal in nature, which would be evident from post-mortem report, in which the cause of death has been shown as asphyxia due to hanging.

5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the gravity of offence and the fact that within one year of the marriage of the deceased, she has died an unnatural death in her matrimonial home, there is specific demand of dowry against the petitioner as also the fact that there is a presumption under Sections 113-A and 113-B of the Indian Evidence Act against the petitioner and the nature of death whether accidental, homicidal or suicidal doesn't matter, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The prayer for anticipatory bail is, accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

rinkee/-

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

