

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64740 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-399 Year-2023 Thana- MANER District- Patna

Sandesh Kumar son of Sri Ramji Ray Village- Dudhaura Ps- Maner Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shobha Devi D/o- Sri Digri Ray Village- Bhagwatipur Po Ps- Bihta Dist- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Ravi Kant Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mrs.Veena Kumari Jaiswal
	Mrs.Shashi Priya
	Mr. Ritwaj Raman

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

7 24-06-2024 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 offence under Sections 363, 365, 498-A of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, daughter of the informant Shobha Devi was married with one Ajit Kumar 15 years ago, however; due to illness, 8 year ago, the husband of informant's daughter died. After the death of Ajit Kumar, with the consent of both parties, informant's daughter Shobha Devi was married with this petitioner, who is younger brother of Ajit Kumar. It is further alleged that after some time, this petitioner started committing torture and harassment to informant's daughter, as



there was illicit relation between this petitioner and one lady working in Ganpati Hospital, which was being objected by informant's daughter. Lastly, on 06.05.2023, the informant received an information that his daughter is missing since 24.05.2023. Informant suspects that this petitioner and his other family members, under a conspiracy, have killed his daughter.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. As a matter of fact, the victim had gone Maner Bazar to purchase some clothes , but she did not return, for which, a *Sanaha* was also lodged by this petitioner on 10.05.2023. He further submits that petitioner never solemnized marriage with the victim (Shobha Devi).

5. However, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for opposite party no. 2 submits that petitioner is husband of the victim, who is still traceless, and in spite of that, petitioner has never taken any initiative to trace the victim.

6. Considering the conduct and behaviour of the petitioner as well as the fact that the victim, who is wife of this petitioner, is still traceless, the prayer for



anticipatory bail of petitioner is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

anay

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

