

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.89057 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2024 Thana- HATHUA District- Gopalganj

Ranjit Kumar Thakur @ Ranjit Thakur S/o Arjun Thakur R/o vill - Bari
Deoria, P.S - Hathua, Distt.- Gopalganj, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Akshay Ashish, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jai Narain Thakur, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

5 04-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Hathua P.S. Case No. 10 of 2024 instituted for the offence
under Sections 304(B) & 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Prosecution case in brief is that daughter of the
informant was done to death at her matrimonial house due to
non-fulfillment of the demand for dowry by her in-laws. It is
also alleged that in order to disappear the evidence, accused
persons have cremated the dead body of the deceased.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged
against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case.



Petitioner is the husband of the deceased. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not present at the time of occurrence, as he was working abroad. From perusal of the FIR, it would transpire that the mother of the deceased has raised suspicion against the petitioner for the commission of murder. Learned counsel submits that family members of the petitioner as well as informant were present at the time of cremation of dead-body of deceased. There is no eye witness to the occurrence. In-laws of the deceased have been granted bail by this Court vide orders dated 22-10-2024 & 05-12-2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 39397 of 2024 & Cr. Misc. No. 83212 of 2024, respectively.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as also the nature and gravity of offence, in my view, this is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail, hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

8. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the court below within a period of four weeks from today and prays



for regular bail, the same would be considered by the court below in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

