

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65708 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-66 Year-2024 Thana- MANJHI District- Saran

=====

Raman Kumar Singh @ Raman Kumar Son of Upendra Singh @ Upendra Kumar Singh Resident of Village - Bhajouna, Nachap, P.S. - Manjhi, District - Saran, Bihar - 841208

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Soni Srivastava
		Ms. Sarandha Suman
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Anil Kumar Singh No. 1
For the Informant	:	Mr. Dewendra Narayan Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 313-12-2024
1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304-B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier Upendra Singh and Meera Singh, the father and mother of the instant petitioner, had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No. 42827 of 2024 and the same was allowed by an order dated 23.09.2024.



4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from perusal of the order dated 23.09.2024, it would manifest that while granting the privilege of anticipatory bail to Upendra Singh and Meera Singh, the Court had considered the case on merits and in details and after hearing the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and the learned APP on behalf of the State. It is next submitted that from perusal of the order dated 23.09.2024, it would manifest that this Court had discussed the case in detail as it was submitted on behalf of the parents of the petitioner that the deceased was in love with the brother-in-law of her sister and as such she never wanted to marry the instant petitioner, but after marriage also she maintained relations with the brother-in-law of her sister, which was objected by the instant petitioner and his parents, further the call details of the deceased, instant petitioner and the family members of the deceased was also investigated by the Investigating Officer and it was found that a day prior to the occurrence, the deceased had talked with her family members including the family members of the petitioner and on the date of occurrence also, instant petitioner was in constant touch with the family members of the deceased informing them that the deceased has locked herself in the room, on which the elder



sister of the deceased had even requested the petitioner to break the door open.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that petitioner is a Central Government employee and he is aware of the consequences which would follow in the event he is implicated in a case relating to murder of his wife. It is also submitted that allegation is of demand of dowry of a Maruti Wagon-R car and it does not appear probable that for not fulfilling the demand, the petitioner and his family members would have killed the deceased. It is next submitted that all these aspects have been discussed in detail in the order dated 23.09.2024 in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 42827 of 2024. It is next submitted that no doubt the deceased died within seven years of marriage, but then all deaths are not dowry deaths.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State and the informant opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is the husband, as such, the yardstick for considering his bail should be different from the yardstick adopted for considering the bail application of Upendra Singh and Meera Singh. It is further submitted that from perusal of the postmortem report, it would manifest that



the doctor has recorded that the dead body of the deceased was received on 07.03.2024 at 04:20 PM and the postmortem commenced at 04:30 PM and it was opined that the time since death to be 20-24 hours which amply demonstrates that the deceased was killed on 06.03.2024 itself and thereafter the entire stage was set by the accused persons to show that the deceased committed suicide on 07.03.2024.

7. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner rebuts the submission of the the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and submits that the postmortem report is not a sacrosanct document and it is required to be tested in the duly constituted trial, it is also submitted that the entire investigation which took place points to the fact that petitioner was in constant touch with the family members of the deceased when the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is also submitted that charges have been framed and trial has commenced, but not a single witness has been examined till date. It is next submitted that the petitioner will not abscond rather will co-operate in the trial to prove his innocence.

8. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, be



released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Manjhi P.S. Case No. 66 of 2024.

9. However, it is made clear that if the learned Trial Court comes to a conclusion that petitioner after his release is trying to delay the trial in any manner in that event the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner forthwith after recording reasons.

10. **Accordingly, the instant regular bail application stands allowed.**

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

