

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13973 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-305 Year-2024 Thana- UJIYARPUR District- Samastipur

1. Ramkalit Chaudhary @ Ramkalit Choudhary @ Lalit Chaudhary @ Lalit Choudhary Son of Umesh Chaudhary @ Umesh Choudhary Village -Pataili Purvi, Ward No 3, PS- Ujiyarur District -Samastipur
2. Indrashan Devi @ Indrashan Kumari Wife of Ramkalit Chaudhary @ Ramkalit Choudhary @ Lalit Chaudhary @ Lalit Choudhary Village -Pataili Purvi, Ward No 3, PS- Ujiyarur District -Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Baidhyanath Thakur
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bharat Bhushan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 13-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in Ujiyarpur P. S. Case No.305 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80, 238 and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that daughter of the informant married to Dinkar Choudhary in the Year 2019. It is further submitted that the marriage was a love marriage and the informant alleges that



the victim after marriage for sometimes was kept well, but after sometimes, she was subjected to torture and cruelty for non-fulfilment of dowry demand and her husband and parents in-laws used to threaten her that she will be killed. Further, on an earlier occasion, the police had to intervene to sort out the issue by explaining the accused persons. Further, on 09.11.2024 at 7.00 P.M., he got an information that his daughter has been killed by the accused persons including the petitioner and the dead body is being cremated near Pataili Pokhar. Accordingly, he reached the place of occurrence after informing the police and the accused persons on seeing the informant and his family members fled from the cremation ground.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant being brother in-law and sister in-law of the deceased. It is next submitted that petitioners are separate in mess and property. It is next submitted that whenever any occurrence of the nature as alleged takes place, the entire family members are implicated in a mechanical manner with general and omnibus allegation. It is next submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail



application and submits that what is not disputed rather stands admitted that the daughter of the informant died and the accused persons instead of informing the informant took the dead body for cremating and it was only when informant was informed by someone that he reached the cremation ground when the accused persons fled leaving the burning dead body. It is next submitted that had the petitioners been not involved in the occurrence, in that event, they would not have allowed other family members to cremate the dead body without informing the informant and having post mortem done.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The prayer of the petitioners for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

