

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60949 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-468 Year-2022 Thana- MADHEPURA District- Madhepura

Pradeep Rishidev S/O Arjun Rishideo Resdients of Village- Budhma, Ward
No. 11, P.S- Madhepura (Bharrahi O.P), District- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uma Shankar Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 18-02-2025 Heard Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr. Uma Shankar Prasad Singh, learned

APP.

2. The petitioners are in custody in connection with
Madhepura P.S Case No.468 of 2022 in S. T. No.180 of 2023,
for the offence punishable under Sections 304B, 302, 34 of the
Indian Penal Code lodged on 21.05.2022 by the informant, Ms.
Meero Devi.

3. Pursuant to the last order, the past and present I.O.
of the case namely, Mr. Rajendra Prasad Yadav and Mr. Arjun
Kumar Ojha are present. The S.P., Madhepura, has also
submitted his report by way of an affidavit, according to



which, having seen the lapses in the investigation, the then P.S.I. Mr. Rajendra Prasad Yadav has been suspended and departmental proceeding has been initiated. Further, the F.S.L. report has been procured which do not talk about any metallic or other pesticidal element and as such, poisoning has been ruled out.

4. As per the prosecution story, the daughter of the informant namely Guddi Kumari got married with Pradeep Rishideo and out of the said wedlock, two female children were born. The allegation is that she was being tortured for demand of dowry. On the fateful day, Guddi Kumari was killed by her in-laws and the husband and after receiving the information, the informant went to the house and found the dead-body and all the accused were absconding. This led to the F.I.R.

5. Though, poisoning has been ruled out, Mr. Uma Shankar Prasad Singh has taken this Court to the Police report which has been incorporated in the case diary (paragraph 2), where the injuries were found from the head up to chest on the left side beside the left eye. He submits that the lady was in her parents home from where in the evening, she was brought to the in-laws house and the very next morning, she died in



mysterious circumstances.

6. This, coupled with the fact that he evaded arrest, the occurrence is of 19.05.2022 but he walked into judicial custody only on 07.12.2023, in that circumstance, it would be appropriate that he faces Trial.

7. Learned Counsel for the petitioner Mr. Uday Chand Prasad submits that he has already remained in custody for more than 14 months and shall be diligently appearing in trial, if granted relief.

8. The kind of allegation that has come against the petitioner, he being the husband, there was allegation of dowry, immediately after she was brought to the in-laws house, died within a day, the husband cannot exonerate himself from the responsibility. As rightly pointed out by the learned APP, he instead of joining hands in the investigation, evaded arrest for more than a year.

9. In that background, for the present, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of bail, which is accordingly rejected.

10. The Trial Court is directed to ensure that the Trial is taken up and concluded at an earliest given the fact the petitioner has been denied bail.



11. Mr. Arjun Kumar Ojha, the present I.O. has assured this Court that all the witnesses, who are to be examined by the Trial Court, shall be produced on the order of the Trial Court as and when required.

12. The personal appearances of Mr. Arjun Kumar Ojha and Mr. Rajendra Prasad Yadav stand dispensed with.

13. The bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

sharun/-

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

