

Lado Bai vs The State Of Madhya Pradesh on 17 January, 2025

NEUTRAL CITATION NO. 2025:MPHC-GWL:943

1
IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT GWALIOR
BEFORE
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN
ON THE 17th OF JANUARY, 2025
MISC. CRIMINAL CASE No. 56315 of 2024
LADO BAI
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

Appearance:
Shri Daya Ram Sharma, learned counsel for the applicant

Shri Vijay Sundram, Public Prosecutor for respondent/S
Shri Mayank Bajpai, learned counsel for the respondent

ORDER

The present application has been filed under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita Adhiniyam, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant arising out of Crime No.247/2024 registered at Police Station Lahaar, District Bhind for offences punishable under Sections 80, 85, 3(5) BNS.

2. The applicant is mother in law of the deceased who expired on 27/09/2024 within one year four months of her marriage. Learned counsel for the applicant argued that the deceased died by asphyxia due to hanging and the death is suicidal in nature. It is further argued that the complainant party has given an affidavit before this Court along with an application under Section 301(2) Cr.P.C. that the deceased was suffering from stomach problem and on account of stomach problem, she committed suicide and there was no dowry harassment.

NEUTRAL CITATION NO. 2025:MPHC-GWL:943 2 MCRC-56315-2024

3. Learned counsel for the complainant also endorsed that indeed such an affidavit has been given by the father of the deceased.

4. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the bail application on the ground that the deceased died within one year four months of her marriage leaving behind a six months old daughter. It is further argued that affidavit of father of deceased cannot be considered at this stage more so when the same person in the case diary statement has stated that his deceased daughter was being harassed for demand of dowry. Thus, it is contended that the case is not fit for grant of anticipatory

bail.

5. Considering the aforesaid, this Court is of the considered opinion that no sufficient case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail. The application is accordingly, rejected. It is observed that in the event the applicant surrenders before the Trial Court, then her application for regular bail be decided expeditiously.

(VIVEK JAIN) JUDGE RS