

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.61316 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-40 Year-2024 Thana- SAHEBPUR KAMAL District- Begusarai

Punit Yadav S/o Shatruhan Yadav R/o Govindpur, Ward No.8 (Vishanpur Chowk), P.S.- Sahibpur Kamal, District- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Praveen Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Yogendra Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 10-01-2025 Heard Mr. Praveen Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sahebpur Kamal P.S. Case No. 40 of 2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 304(B), 498(A), 120(B) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and section 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act as also section 27 of the Arms Act, lodged on 18.02.2024 by the informant, Rahul Kumar.

3. As per the prosecution story, the sister of the informant was in relationship with Himanshu Kumar and had married in a temple and thereafter, remained at the informant's place. Later, the family started demanding dowry. In between, the marriage of the elder brother of Himanshu (Sudhanshu) was fixed and then the informant decided that the couple should move to the place.

4. Though learned counsel for the petitioner impressed upon this Court that the main role is assigned to Sanjay Yadav, Himanshu Kumar, Sudhanshu Kumar, Samrat Kumar and Jubesh



Kumar and only to implicate the other persons, his name has cropped up. He further submits that the petitioner is 60 years old and he has been implicated in this case.

5. Learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail submitting that he is named accused with the allegation of being part of the said team who opened fire causing death of three innocent persons.

6. It is unfortunate that even after passage of quarter of the 21st Century, if young persons try to tie nuptial knots on their own, the family members resent to it and that results into death of innocent persons. In view of the fact that the petitioner is named in the FIR of triple murder, so far as anticipatory bail is concerned, this Court is not inclined to extend him the privilege of bail. It is accordingly, rejected.

7. However, if the petitioner surrenders and appears before the Court in next four weeks, the Court concerned shall take into account the FIR in totality and shall pass an order without being influenced by the present order and dispose it of preferably on the same day.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

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

