

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76783 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-262 Year-2023 Thana- BRAHMPUR District- Buxar

-
1. Ram Kumar Ram S/O Late Munshi Ram R/O Village- Ossain, P.S. - Bihiyan, District- Bhojpur (Ara) At Present R/O Village Pachphedwa, P.S. Brahmpur, District- Buxar.
 2. Lakshmina Devi W/O Ram Kumar Ram R/O Village- Ossain, P.S. - Bihiyan, District- Bhojpur (Ara) At Present R/O Village Pachphedwa, P.S. Brahmpur, District- Buxar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amit Kumar Pandey
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anita Kumari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 06-12-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out of Brahmpur Police Station Case No. 262 of 2023, disclosing offences under Sections 304B, 201, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the First Information Report the marriage of the informant's daughter, was solemnized with the co-accused / Deepak Kumar, who happens to be the son of the petitioners. The marriage was solemnized in the year 2018 and after five years of marriage the informant's daughter died in her matrimonial home in suspicious condition, the information of which was received by the informant after 04.05.2023 and upon inquiry, he came to know from the nearby people that his daughter has been killed and her body has been disposed of.



4. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and they have falsely been implicated in the present case merely being father and mother of the husband of the deceased. Petitioners are separate in mess and property from the family of the co-accused Deepak (husband of the deceased) and they are having no concern with co-accused Deepak’s family affairs. There is no specific allegation against the petitioners. Petitioners have nothing to do with the alleged demand of dowry. He next submits that from the wedlock, two children were born and the petitioners are taking care of the minor children of the deceased.

5. Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the fact that anticipatory bail application of the petitioners has already been rejected by this Court on merit vide order dated 19.03.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 70395 of 2023, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

