

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.6435 of 2021**

Ganeshwari Devi Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Shashi Kant Mishra, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Vijay Kr. Sinha, Addl.P.P

Order No.02 Dated- 09.09.2021

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter within two weeks after the lockdown is over.

In view of personal undertaking given by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter are ignored for the present.

Apprehending her arrest in connection with Dhurwa P.S. Case No.104 of 2021 registered under Sections 304 (B) of the Indian Penal Code, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner being the mother-in-law of the deceased- Aanchal Kumari, has committed the dowry death of her daughter-in-law. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is next submitted that the petitioner was staying separately from the deceased and her husband with her another son namely Amirchand. It is next submitted that the petitioner is an old and ailing widow and as such, she was not in a state of mind to inflict torture upon the deceased. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned Addl.P.P appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner of demanding money as dowry and the deceased died otherwise than normal circumstances within seven years of her marriage by hanging herself. Hence, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation of the case to find out the details of the case. Therefore, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the privileges of

anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner of and the requirement of her custodial interrogation during the investigation of the case, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the privileges of anticipatory bail be given to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the above named petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Animesh/