

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.84303 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-72 Year-2023 Thana- BHARGAMA District- Araria

Pappu Mehta Son Of Badri Mehta R/O Village- Raghunathpur, Ward No. 4
Police Station- Bhargama, Dist.- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajnish Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rajiv Nayan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

4 20-03-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has renewed his prayed for bail which was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dt. 4.8.2023 in Cr. Misc. No. 46641 of 2023 in connection with Bhargama P.S. Case No. 72 of 2023 instituted for the offence under Section 304B/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, the informant alleged that his sister was married with the petitioner four years ago and thereafter, the petitioner along with his family members subjected her to cruelty due to non-fulfillment of dowry demand. Ultimately, on 17.3.2023 the informant came to that his sister was committed murder by administering poison.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and committed no offence. The petitioner



is husband of the deceased due to which he has falsely been implicated in this case. The informant is not eye witness to the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent and languishing in judicial custody since 19.3.2023.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that the death of the informant's sister was caused within seven year of her marriage. The petitioner is husband of the deceased upon whom the full responsibility to keep his wife well. From perusal of F.S.L. report, it appears THIMET was detected which is highly poisonous and commonly used in agriculture for killing pests.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude within a period of six months, failing which, the petitioner may renew his prayer of bail.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Amandeep/-

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

