

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69372 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-121 Year-2023 Thana- DAWATH District- Rohtas

=====

Amit Sharma @ Jai Prakash Sharma @ Amit Kumar Vishwakarma S/o- Jai Mangal Sharma @ Jaymangal Sharma Village- Babhnaul, P.S. Dawath, Dist- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prashant Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND MALVIYA

ORAL ORDER

3 18-01-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Dawath P.S Case No. 121 of 2023 instituted for the offence punishable under Sections 304(B), 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, it is a case of dowry death due to non-fulfilment of dowry demand by the deceased and her husband.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He next submits that petitioner is the husband of the deceased and the petitioner has got clean antecedent as stated in para-3 of the petition and there is no specific allegation against the petitioner for committing the murder of the deceased. He next submits that



the petitioner was not present at home while the sad demise of his wife took place and the petitioner was posted at the time of occurrence was at Gwalior. He next submits that similarly situated co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court passed in Cr. Misc. No. 23264 of 2024.

5. Learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased.

6. From perusal of the F.I.R., and impugned order dated 05.07.2024, it appears that petitioner is the husband of the deceased and sole responsibility is fixed upon the husband of the deceased to take care of of her wife in all respect. It appears from the case diary at para.03, 04, 25 and 26 shows that prosecution witnesses have also supported the case of the prosecution and the case is very serious in nature as mentioned in the impugned order, so I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Brajesh Kumar/-

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

