

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.315 of 2006**

Shrawan Paswan @ Laddu Paswan, Son of Laghu Paswan @ Prakash
Paswan, resident of Village-Jankidih, P.S. Chanan, District- Lakhisarai.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance:

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Vipul Sinha, Amicus Curiae
For the Respondent/s : Ms. Anita Kumari Singh, App

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND MALVIYA
ORAL JUDGMENT**

Date: 16-06-2025

Heard Mr. Vipul Sinha learned *Amicus Curiae*
for the appellant and Ms. Anita Kumari Singh, learned APP for
the State.

2. The present appeal has been filed under
Section 374(2) of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973
(hereinafter referred as 'Cr.P.C') challenging the Judgment of
conviction dated 25.02.2006 and order of sentence dated
28.02.2006 in Sessions Trial No. 165 of 2001 arising out of
Lakhisarai P.S. Case No. 118 of 2000 passed by the learned
Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court No.-II, Lakhisarai
whereby and where under the appellant has been convicted for
the offence punishable under Sections 304 (B) and 201 of the
Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred as 'IPC') and has been



sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for seven years for the offence punishable under Section 304 (B) of the IPC and further three years of imprisonment for the offence punishable under Section 201 of the IPC and also directed to pay a fine of Rs. 1,000/- and in default of payment of fine, he is also directed to undergo further two months of simple imprisonment and both the sentences will run concurrently.

3. The brief facts leading to the filing of the present appeal is that the informant namely Kishori Paswan (PW-4) made a written report on 15.04.2000 before Officer-In-Charge of Chanan P.S. that on 29.04.1998 his daughter Pinki Kumari (deceased) was married to the appellant (Shrawan Paswan) and after marriage she went to her matrimonial home. After some days she was brought back to her parental home, when she was pregnant and on that time she disclosed that she would not stay in her matrimonial home, because her Sasur, Sas, Bari Gotani, Manighali Gotani, Bhaisur, Maijhala Bhaisur and Dever as also her husband used to torture and assault her for bringing cash of Rs. 10,000/- and a Colour T.V. They were also threatening to leave her and to kill her. After hearing these things, the informant had assured that when he will get money, he will fulfill their demand. The informant's daughter had again



went to her matrimonial home when she was about four months pregnant and resided there. The informant's mother had gone to Kumardih on 16.03.2000 to attend the marriage of younger brother of his son-in-law where the informant's daughter had also gone and she had told to her grand-mother that her husband was demanding Rs.10,000/-cash, colour T.V. and one palung and for this reason, she was being assaulted and tortured. On 14.04.2000, in the evening, the informant got information that his daughter was killed by inmates of her sasural. On 15.04.2000, the informant went to Jankidih and there, on inquiry, he came to know that on 12.04.2000, his daughter was killed by the inmates of her sasural and her dead body was burnt (cremated).

4. On the basis of the written report of the informant, an F.I.R. was lodged on 16.04.2000, Lakhisarai P.S. Case No. 118 of 2000 dated 16.04.2000 has registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498A, 304B and 201 read with 34 of the IPC against total seven accused persons and after completion of investigation, charge-sheet was submitted against total four accused persons namely Shrawan Paswan @ Laddu Paswan, Lal Paswan, Lakshmi Paswan and Charitar Paswan for the offences punishable under Sections 306 and 201 read with



34 of the IPC and accordingly the cognizance of offences under Sections 306 and 201 read with 34 of the IPC was taken, against four accused persons and the case was committed to the Court of sessions. The charges were framed against the accused persons which was explained to them and they denied of prosecution taking plea of false implication in the case and claimed to be innocent.

5. On behalf of prosecution altogether 5 witnesses were examined to substantiate the charges leveled against the appellant, who are namely, PW-1 Siya Sharan Paswan, PW-2 Geeta Devi (mother of the deceased), PW-3 Ramsakhi Devi (grandmother of the deceased), PW-4 Kishori Paswan (informant), and PW-5 Raj Ballabh Singh (I.O.). On behalf of the defense 5 Defence witnesses were also examined. They are DW-1 Parmeshwar Modi, DW-2 Raja Ram Modi, DW-3 Raj Pati Sharma DW-4 Mishri Paswan and DW-5 Surendra Paswan.

6. PW-1 in his examination-in-chief stated, that on 12.04.2000, residents of Jankidih had told him that at tea stall one married women was killed in the village Jankidih. The grand daughter of this witness Pinki (deceased) was married with Shrawan Kumar Paswan in the village Jankidih. After



getting information, he had gone to Jankidih where he had found that the Sasural of deceased Pinki was locked. The persons of the vicinity had told him that since colour T.V. and cash was not given, his grand daughter was murdered by the accused Shrawan Paswan @ Laddu Paswan and his family members. He had not seen the dead body of deceased Pinki.

6.i. In his cross-examination, he stated that he had called the informant Kishori Paswan, who was his nephew, at Dhanbad, by telephone and had talked with informant's mother and both Kishori Paswan and his mother had come on 14.04.2000.

7. PW-2 Geeta Devi wife of the informant and the mother of the deceased in her examination-in-chief, stated that the occurrence was of 12.04.2000 and on 14.04.2000, she had come to know about the occurrence, at Barh, where she had gone to the house of her brother to attend a marriage. There she had got information that her daughter was killed, for dowry. She further stated that on 29.04.1998 her daughter was married with accused Shrawan Paswan. After two months of marriage, her daughter and son-in-law had come to Dhanbad when the deceased was having two months pregnancy and at that time, her daughter had told her that she was not willing to go back to



her Sasural because her husband and his family members were demanding cash Rs. 10,000/-, colour T.V. and one palung. Her son-in-law had also told that he will not bring her daughter to the Sasural if those demands were not fulfilled. Then after about one year and two months, her daughter had gone to her sasural under an agreement.

8. PW-3 Ramsakhi Devi who is the grand mother of the deceased in her examination-in-chief, stated that her granddaughter Pinki Kumari was married with accused Shrawan Paswan. The husband, father-in-law and mother-in-law were demanding cash Rs. 10,000/-, Colour T.V. and one palung. while attending the marriage at Kuandih (Andal, West Bengal) her grand daughter Pinki had told her that dire consequences may follow if cash Rs. 10,000/-, colour T.V. and one palung are not given and she had also told her that her grand daughter was also being assaulted. PW-3 has stated that Pinki was murdered by inmates of her Sasural and her Dewar Siya Sharan had informed her about the murder of Pinki, at Dhanbad, on telephone.

8.i. In her cross-examination, she stated that she does not remember the reason for demanding cash Rs. 10,000/- and she cannot say the time when the cash was demanded for the first time. Further she stated that the money was demanded



for purchase of four kathas land.

9. PW-4 Kishori Paswan informant in his examination-in-chief, stated that his daughter Pinki was married on 29.04.1998 with accused/ appellant Shrawan Paswan and after marriage Pinki had gone to her Sasural at Jankidih. In the month of Sawan when Pinki had come, she had told him that her husband, father-in-law and mother-in-law were torturing her and were demanding cash of Rs. 10,000/-, Colour T.V. and one palung. Further after 13-14 months, Pinki had again gone to her Sasural. Dewar (brother-in-law) of Pinki being namely Jalo Paswan was married at Kumardih, Andal, where Pinki had met with her grand mother, about 26-27 days prior to the occurrence at the time of the said marriage and when his mother (informant's mother) had come back after attending that marriage, she had told him that Pinki was saying about the demand of cash Rs. 10,000/-, Colour T.V. and one palung, by the inmates of her sasural and Pinki was being tortured there for this reason. He further stated that the inmates of Sasural of Pinki were demanding those articles and cash from him also. PW-4 has identified his signature on the written report marked as Ext.1. This witness identified only accused Shrawan Paswan and he did not identify another accused Lakshmi Paswan, in



Court.

9.i. In his cross-examination, he stated that the defence has shown one inland letter to this witness but he had denied his writing and signature on the same. That letter has been marked Ext. 'X' for identification. He further stated that Pinki had received education up to standard VII but she had not written any letter to him and when Pinki had complained him against the inmates of her sasural, he had not lodged any Sanha rather a Panchayati was held but he does not remember the date of Panchayati. He stated that he had come from Barh to Lakhisarai on 14.04.2000 in the evening.

10. PW-5 Raj Ballabh Singh, the Investigating Officer in his examination-in-chief stated that he had inspected the place of occurrence which was shown to him by one Lakshiya Devi. The place of occurrence is the house of accused Lakshu Paswan in village Jankidih. He had found the case true for the offences punishable under Sections 306 and 201 read with 34 of the IPC and he had submitted charge-sheet against the accused persons for these offences keeping the investigation pending against other accused persons namely Karu Paswan, Jairam Paswan, Lakshu Paswan and Sanjha Devi.

10.i. He in his cross-examination stated that in



course of investigation, one witness Lakshiya Devi has told him that the deceased was suffering Epilepsy and due to this reason, she had died. According to para 3 of his evidence, one witness Anil Paswan had told him that the deceased had consumed poison and died. He also stated that the witness Chhabila Bind had stated before him that on the date of occurrence, some quarrel had taken place between the husband and wife due to which wife of Shrawan Paswan had consumed poison.

10.ii. He further stated that witness Wakil Paswan had stated before him that on the date of occurrence, some dispute had taken place between Shrawan Paswan and his wife in which the wife had given fist blow upon Shrawan Paswan due to which Shrawan Paswan had fell down and then mother of Shrawan Paswan and village women had condemned the victim as to how she had assaulted her husband and hearing these talks, the wife of Shrawan Paswan had consumed the medicine which is used to keep the wheat-grain safe and then hulla was raised that wife of Shrawan had consumed poison. Witness Pankaj Paswan had stated the same thing before him. He stated that witness Baunku Paswan had also stated the same thing before him that the girl had assaulted her husband due to which her husband felt down and the family members had



admonished her due to which wife of Shrawan had consumed the medicine which is used to protect the grains from pesticides.

10.iii. He further stated that Siya Sharan Paswan (PW-1) had told before him that father-in-law of deceased Pinki had come to Lakhisarai on 13.04.2000 to inform about the occurrence and after getting information, he had gone to Jankidih by scooter where he had come to know that Pinki Kumari was killed by administering poison and the dead body was burnt in the forest. He also stated that witness Gita Devi (PW-2) had told him that she had come to know about the occurrence on 15.04.2000 in her Naihar. Witness Ramsakhi (PW-3) had not told him that she was told by Pinki about the assault faced by the deceased and about the demand of T.V., Cash Rs.10,000/- and palung.

11. After closure of the prosecution evidence, the appellants were examined under Section 313 of the Cr.P.C where they claimed that the prosecution evidence is false and they are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case.

12. DW-1 Parmeshwar Modi in his examination-in-chief stated that there was some dispute between Shrawan Paswan and his wife and the wife had assaulted Shrawan by



fists due to which teeth of Shrawan was broken. When the village women were discussing the matter and condemning as to how a wife had assaulted her husband, out of shame and guilt of hitting her husband the wife of Shrawan had consumed the poison which is used to be kept in wheat. He has denied from demand of dowry. The victim was tried to be saved by the family members of the accused but she could not be saved. He also stated that the deceased Pinki was not treated by any doctor.

13. DW-2 Raja Ram Modi in his examination-in-chief stated that he had heard on Ram Navmi hulla about consumption of poison by the deceased when he was crossing through front portion of the house of the accused persons. He had seen that the wife of Shrawan Paswan was being administered Surf etc and persons were talking that she will not survive. They were trying to bring her for treatment but she had died in the gali. He has also stated that in a dispute between the husband and wife, the wife had slapped her husband and the persons were complaining that why she had assaulted her husband. Due to humiliation, she had consumed poison. He had not seen the father-in-law of accused Shrawan Paswan in the village nor he (father-in-law) had inquired from anyone in the village.



14. DW-3 Rajpati Sharma in his examination-in-chief stated the same thing as stated by DW- 2 Raja Ram Modi and he has further stated that the doctor was called upon who had stated that the matter was not able to be controlled.

15. DW-4 Mishri Paswan in his examination-in-chief stated that he had come to know about the occurrence on hulla and he had seen that the women of the family of accused were trying that the wife of Shrawan could vomit and she was further being tried to be brought to Lakhisarai for treatment but she died in the way to her treatment. In the village, Chaukidar was Banke who had informed the police. Police had come and had told to burn (cremate) the dead body and thereafter, the dead body was cremated. He also stated that wife of Shrawan was urban lady and she had assaulted her husband. The village women were condemning her for the same and due to humiliation, she had consumed poison.

16. DW-5 Surendra Paswan has denied the case of prosecution and he has stated the same thing as stated by other defence witnesses that the family members of sasural of deceased were trying that the deceased could vomit but she could not be saved and at that time Chaukidar Banke Paswan was also present who had informed the police and the police had



told to get the dead body cremated. Thereafter, this witness and others had cremated the dead body beside the river, in the forest. He has also stated that there is no electricity in his village and so allegation of demand of colour T.V. is baseless.

17. The learned *Amicus Curiae* submitted that the impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence are not sustainable in the eye of law or on facts. Learned trial Court has not applied its judicial mind and erroneously passed the judgment of conviction and order of sentence and from perusal of the evidences adduced on behalf of the prosecution it is crystal clear that the prosecution's case is false and fabricated.

17.i. Learned *Amicus Curiae* further submitted that there is lack of evidence on the point of cruelty or torture soon before that the death of victim. The main ingredients of Section 304B of the IPC have not been established by the prosecution. He further submitted that PW-1, during his examination before the police had stated that he was informed about the death of Pinki in Lakhisarai on 13.04.2000 and he rushed to Jankidih whereas PW-1 stated before the Court that he had received information of death at a tea stall and he had given information on telephone at Dhanbad and he had talked with the mother of the informant. Then informant came on 14.04.2000



along with his mother and the Informant went before the police on 15.04.2000 and the case was registered on 16.04.2000.

17.ii. The version of PW-1 falsifies the evidence of PW-4 where he has stated that he had received Information of death at Barh and he had come to Lakhisarni from Barh. PW-2 has contradicted the version of police and has tried to make a case of dowry death. PW-3 had admitted that she had received the information of death in Dhanbad. In para 5, she admitted that Sasural people had demanded rupees for purchase of 4 katha of land. But before police, she had never stated about the demand of cash, T.V. and palung. PW-4 has stated in para 2 that the deceased Pinki had gone in a marriage ceremony of her Dewar at Kumardih 25-26 days before her death. This clearly indicates that there was no bad relation between deceased and her Sasural people and even with her husband. The Informant has stated in para 6 that Pinki was Middle Pass but no any letter was written or any message was sent by her to her Naihar. In para-9, the informant has betrayed from his earlier version given before the police. Before police, he had admitted that he had come on 13.04.2000 but the case was lodged on 16.04.2008 The Investigating Officer had inspected the place of occurrence. and he had examined altogether nine witnesses including the



Defadar of tile village but all those witnesses have not been examined which has caused prejudice to the defence. According to the I.O. the present case is not a case of dowry-death.

17. iii. Learned *Amicus Curiae* further submitted that it is crystal clear from the deposition of the defense witnesses that there was a quarrel between the husband and wife and the deceased had slapped her husband and this fact spread in the village and the village women condemned her and humiliated her, so the deceased being humiliated, swallowed a poison tablet and killed herself. It is further evident that the efforts made by the Sasural people and villagers to save her but she could not be survived. The date of occurrence was the day of Hindu Festival Ram Navami and the village people were not hoisting sacred flag of Mahavirji till the dead body was in the village arc so such villagers cremated the dead body. The defence witnesses are all villagers of the place of the occurrence who had given true picture of the occurrence and their evidences find corroboration from the statement of the police. It is not a case of abatement of suicide rather it is well established case of suicide.

17.iv. DW-1 has stated that there was good relation between the spouse. DW-4 has Stated in his evidence



that inmates of her sasural were trying to save the life of deceased by administering surf, poison etc but she could not be survived. DW-5 has also stated that the inmates of her sasural were trying to save the deceased and he has further stated that Chaukidar Bauku Paswan was also there who ordered to cremate the dead body. It has been submitted that the Chaukidar happens to be the brother-in-law of the deceased. The evidences of defence clearly shows that the deceased had committed suicide which was also supported by the police.

17.v. Learned *Amicus Curiae* for the appellant lastly contended that in view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the prosecution has failed to prove beyond all reasonable doubts that contraband was recovered from the possession of the appellant. Hence, the prosecution case against the appellant fails on this ground alone. The alleged confession is also not admissible. So, the appellant should have been acquitted from the conviction as sentenced against them.

18. However, learned APP for the State defends the impugned judgment of conviction and the order of sentence submitting that there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned judgment and order of sentence, because prosecution has proved its case against the appellant that the death of married women



was not natural and within seven years of marriage in the matrimonial home due to dowry demand. In view of the aforesaid statements and the evidence on record, learned trial Court has rightly convicted the appellant and the present appeal should not be entertained.

19. At this stage, I would like to appreciate the relevant extract of entire evidence led by the prosecution before the Trial Court. I have thoroughly perused the materials on record and as well as given thoughtful consideration to the submissions advanced by both the parties.

20. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Charan Singh v. State of Uttarakhand 2023 SCC online SC 452*** has laid down that:

wherein a woman died an unnatural death in her matrimonial home, held that mere death of the deceased being unnatural in the matrimonial home within seven years of marriage will not be sufficient to convict the accused under Section 304-B and 498-A IPC if the cruelty or harassment has not been proved to be soon before the death.

21. On deeply studied and scrutinized all evidences, it is evident to note that the prosecution alleged that the deceased was murdered by the accused persons for demand of dowry. The defence denied the allegation leveled against



them and said that the deceased died due to the administration of poison as she face humiliation from the villagers for her act of assaulting her husband and also due to this she encountered condemnation from the family members of her husband and from the other women of the village. It has been analysed from the above mentioned facts that she was ashamed and feeling guilty of her act due to which she administered poison. The demand of dowry was not established in the instant case as there exist contradiction in the allegation of demand of dowry from the deposition of PW 3 whether the demand was of Rs. 10,000/- cash, colour T.V. and a plong or the cash for purchasing 4 kathas land. On a collective appreciation of the evidence I am of the considered view that the per-requisites to raise presumption under Section 304B of the IPC and Section 113B of the Indian Evidence Act having not been fulfilled, so the conviction of the appellant cannot be justified.

21.i. Mere death of the deceased being unnatural in the matrimonial home within seven years of marriage will not be sufficient to convict the accused under Section 498A and 304B of the IPC. In the present cases the demand of dowry which has been narrated by prosecution witnesses appears to be fallacious. The aforesaid evidence led by the prosecution does



not fulfill the per-requisites to invoke presumption under Section 304B IPC or Section 113B of the Indian Evidence Act.

21.ii. To attract the provision of Section 304-B of the Code, one of the main ingredients of the offence which is required to be established is that “soon before her death” she was subjected to cruelty and harassment “in connection with the demand for dowry”. To appreciate the arguments raised by the learned counsel for the parties, a perusal of section 304B and 498A of the IPC and Section 113B of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 would be required. The same are extracted herein below:-
Section 304B of the IPC read as follow:

“304B. Dowry death.— (1) Where the death of a woman is caused by any burns or bodily injury or occurs otherwise than under normal circumstances within seven years of her marriage and it is shown that soon before her death she was subjected to cruelty or harassment by her husband or any relative of her husband for, or in connection with, any demand for dowry, such death shall be called “dowry death”, and such husband or relative shall be deemed to have caused her death.

Explanation-For the purpose of this sub-section, “dowry” shall have the same meaning as in Section 2 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 (28 of 1961). (2)

Whoever commits dowry death shall be



punished with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than seven years but which may extend to imprisonment for life.

21.iii. The essential ingredients of dowry death under Section 304-B of the IPC are as follow:

(i) death of the woman concerned is by any burns or bodily injury or by any cause other than in normal circumstances, and

(ii) is within seven years of her marriage, and

(iii) that soon before her death, she was subjected to cruelty or harassment by her husband or any relative of the husband for, or in connection with, any demand for dowry.

21.iv. The accused must have subjected the woman to cruelty in connection with demand for dowry soon before her death and that this ingredient has to be proved by the prosecution beyond all reasonable doubt and only then the Court will presume that the accused has committed the offence of dowry death under Section 113B of the Indian Evidence Act. Section 498A of the IPC read as:

“Section 498A: Husband or relative of husband of a woman subjecting her to cruelty — Whoever, being the husband or the relative of the husband of a woman, subjects such woman to cruelty shall be punished with imprisonment for a term



which may extend to three years and shall also be liable to fine. Explanation. — For the purposes of this section, “cruelty” means—

(a) any wilful conduct which is of such a nature as is likely to drive the woman to commit suicide or to cause grave injury or danger to life, limb or health (whether mental or physical) of the woman; or

(b) harassment of the woman where such harassment is with a view to coercing her or any person related to her to meet any unlawful demand for any property or valuable security or is on account of failure by her or any person related to her to meet such demand”

21.v. Section 113B of the Indian Evidence Act

read as:

“Section113B: Presumption as to dowry death.— When the question is whether a person has committed the dowry death of a woman and it is shown that soon before her death such woman had been subjected by such person to cruelty or harassment for, or in connection with, any demand for dowry, the Court shall presume that such person had caused the dowry death.”

22. Noticeably this presumption as well is founded on the proof of cruelty or harassment of the woman dead for or in connection with any demand for dowry by the person charged with the offence. The presumption as to dowry death thus would get activated only upon the proof of the fact



that the deceased lady had been subjected to cruelty or harassment for or in connection with any demand for dowry by the accused and that too in the reasonable contiguity of death. Such a proof is thus the legislatively mandated prerequisite to invoke the otherwise statutorily ordained presumption of commission of the offence of dowry death by the person charged therewith. In the present case it has not been established beyond all reasonable doubt that the cause of death is connected with dowry demand.

23. As in the instance case the cause of death appeared to be the administration of poison by the deceased due to the humiliation faced by her as she assaulted her husband. In the view of the above discussion, I am of the view that the prosecution has failed to established the guilt of accused beyond shadow of all reasonable doubt. In the instant case there is no direct or ocular witness is present in the case so the case is completely based on circumstantial evidence. In circumstantial evidence the chain of guilt should clearly established the guilt of accused and no other probability, which is not established in the instant case. There must be a chain of evidence so complete as not to leave any reasonable ground for the conclusion consistent with the innocence of the accused and must show that in all



human probability the act must have been done by the accused.

24. A conjoint reading of these three provisions, thus predicate the burden of the prosecution to unassailable substantiate the ingredients of the two offences by direct and convincing evidence so as to avail the presumption en-grafted in Section 113B of the Act against the accused. Proof of cruelty or harassment by the husband or his relative or the person charged is thus the sine qua non to inspirit the statutory presumption, to draw the person charged within the coils thereof. If the prosecution fails to demonstrate by cogent, coherent and persuasive evidence to prove such fact, the person accused of either of the above referred offences cannot be held guilty by taking refuge only of the presumption to cover up the shortfall in proof and the learned trial Court failed to scrutinize the evidence brought on record regarding deficiencies, drawbacks and infirmities crept during course of trial and passed the impugned judgment in complete ignorance of criminal jurisprudence. Further, there is no eyewitnesses to the said occurrence and all the PW's were hearsay witnesses and have not seen the occurrence. In the instant case that the prosecution failed to established beyond the shadow of all reasonable doubt that the accused must have subjected the deceased victim to



cruelty in connection with demand for dowry soon before her death.

25. Hence, the Judgment of conviction dated 25.02.2006 and order of sentence dated 28.02.2006 passed in Sessions Trial No. 165 of 2001 arising out of Lakhisarai P.S. Case No. 118 of 2000 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court No.-II, Lakhisarai is set aside and the accused/appellant is acquitted from the charges leveled against him. As the appellant is on bail, he is discharged from liability of his bail bond.

26. Before parting with this appeal, Secretary, Patna High Court Legal Services Committee is directed to pay Rs. 8,000/- (eight thousand) to the learned Amicus Curiae, namely, Mr. Vipul Sinha towards honorarium for assisting this Court in the present appeal.

27. Let a copy of first and last page of this judgment be handed over to the advocate Mr. Vipul Sinha, learned Amicus Curiae and Office is directed to proceed further in granting honorarium to him which is to be paid by Patna High Court Legal Services Committee.

28. Accordingly, this appeal is allowed.



29. Office is directed to send back the trial court records and proceedings along with a copy of this judgment to the trial court, forthwith, for necessary compliance, if any.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Anand Kr.

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	18.06.2025
Transmission Date	18.06.2025

