

# Munna Lal @ Ramprasad Chadar vs The State Of Madhya Pradesh on 3 August, 2021

**Author: Virender Singh**

**Bench: Virender Singh**

1

THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
M.Cr.C. No.22737/2021  
(Munna Lal @ Ramprasad Chadar vs The State Of Madhya Pradesh)

Jabalpur, Dated: 03.08.2021

Heard through Video Conferencing.

Shri Jafar Khan, learned counsel for the petitioner  
Shri Pramod Saxena, learned Public Prosecutor for the respondent/State.

Ms. Shweta Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioner  
Learned Public Prosecutor for the State pr  
comply with the direction dated 15.07.2021. He s  
even after serious attempts made by the Investig  
could not get information from the service provi  
phone and still he is trying hard for getting th  
information.

2- Learned counsel for the petitioner serious  
prayer of the State. He submitted that everyday,  
apprehension of his arrest, therefore, this peti  
today itself.

3- On due consideration of the situation, wit  
further time to the State, the arguments of both  
on merit.

ORDER

Crime No.	Under section
208/2021	306, 498-A, 34 of IPC and 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act

4- As declared by the petitioner, this is the

under section 438 Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail.

MCRC-22737-2021 5- It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is father-in-law of the deceased. He was residing separately from the deceased and her husband. Marriage between his son and the deceased was solemnized 10 years ago. No complaint of any type of demand of dowry has ever been made by the deceased during her lifetime or her parents. The main allegation has been made against the husband and aunt of the husband namely Hemlata that they have illicit relationship and she has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. The petitioner is aged about 56 years and arrest may tarnish his image in the society.

6- It is further contended that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is permanent resident of District Sagar, there is no possibility of his absconding or tampering with the prosecution case. He is ready to furnish adequate security and abide by all the terms and conditions as may be imposed by this Court. Therefore, he be granted anticipatory bail.

7- Learned Public Prosecutor has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and referred to the statements of the parents of the deceased and submitted that there is nothing on record to disbelieve them at this stage. There is no evidence that the petitioner was residing separately. The death occurred in the house of the petitioner. The parents of the deceased have submitted that considering the future of their daughter, they never made any complaint even after constant harassment by the petitioner and his son. The presence of the petitioner is necessary for investigation, therefore, the petitioner be not granted anticipatory bail. 8- Learned counsel for the objector has also opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail. Referring to the spot map prepared MCRC-22737-2021 during investigation, learned counsel for the objector submitted that the place of incident is very small room (5x8 feet) and even after death of the deceased by fire, nothing was found disturbed in that room and at the time of visit of police and witnesses, everything was found in place which raises serious doubts regarding the act of the petitioner and his son, therefore, the petitioner be not granted anticipatory bail. 9- Perusal of the case diary shows that the parents of the deceased have made certain allegations regarding demand of dowry and harassment extended by the husband and his father (present petitioner). During the investigation, the police have recorded statements of the petitioner and his son and they have clearly stated that since after the marriage till her death, the deceased was living with them. Before this Court, the petitioner has not come up with any explanation as to why the deceased immolated herself.

10- Serious objection has been made by the counsel for the objector that just a day prior to the incident, the deceased called her father and revealed her ordeal. The police is under process to collect this evidence. Presence of the petitioner may be necessary for just and proper investigation of the case, the case of co-accused Hemlata is different from the case of the present petitioner as she was living separately from the petitioner and the deceased, therefore, I do not find it appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

(Virender Singh) Judge @shish