

FORM-A

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, IIIrd

BHOJPUR AT ARA

Presiding Officer: Sangam Singh,

Date of Judgment - 06th day of July, 2026

SESSIONS TRIAL NO.- 3 OF 2023

(Details of F.I.R./Crime and Police Station)

(Arising out of Tarari P.S. Case No. 213/2021 dated 16.11.2021 U/Ss. 304-B, 201, 34 of IPC)

Complainant	State of Bihar through Pramad Rai, Informant
Represented By	Sri Ajay Kumar, Ld. A.P.P.
Accused	1. Govind Rai @ Govinda Rai, aged about 28 year, Resident of Village Kharauna, PS Tarari, District Bhojpur, Ara.
Represent By	Sri Bishnuddhar Pandey, Ld. Advocate

FORM B

Date of Offence	16.11.2021
Date of FIR	16.11.2021
Date of Charge-sheet	21.03.2022
Date of Cognizance	19.05.2022
Date of Commitment	22.12.2022
Date of Framing of Charges	15.06.2023
Date of commencement of evidence	12.09.2023
Date on which judgment is reserved	30.06.2026
Date of the Judgment	08.07.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	14.07.2026



Presiding Officer : Sangam Singh
Session Trial No. 3 of 2023
Date of Judgment: 08.07.2026

Accused Details:

	1	Govind Rai @ Govinda Rai		20.01.2022	Till in custody	304 - B/34, 302/34, 201/34 of IPC	Whether Acquitted or convicted	Convicted	for offenc e u/s 304-B L.I. and Rs. 20,00 0/- in default of which 2 year additi onal imprisonm ent and for offenc e u/s 201 IPC RI of 2 Y and fine Rs. 5000 and in default of add. Imprison for 3 Mont hs. Both the senten ces will run concu rentl y	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of section 428, Cr.P.C.	NA
--	---	--------------------------------	--	------------	-----------------	---	--------------------------------------	-----------	---	---	----



Presiding Officer : Sangam Singh
Session Trial No. 3 of 2023
Date of Judgment: 08.07.2026

FORM C

List of Prosecution/Defence/Court Witnesses

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
PW1	Tara Devi	Hearsay witness, mother of deceased
PW2	Surendra Rai	Hearsay witness, brother of deceased
PW3	Promod Rai	Hearsay Witness, informant and father of victim
PW4	Bal Krishna Mahato	Investigating Officer

B. Defence Witnesses, if any:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
DW1	Govinda Rai @ Govinda Kumar	Husband of deceased Anjali Devi
DW2	Chandan Kumar	Deputy Registrar Patliputra Municipal Corporation
DW3	Akhilesh Rai	Neighbour of Govinda Rai, the Husband of Deceased
DW4	Mandhar Rai	Neighbour of Govinda Rai, the Husband of Deceased

C. Court Witnesses, if any:

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
N/A		

LIST OF PROSECUTION/DEFENCE/COURT

A. Prosecution:

Sr. No	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Exhibit - 1	Signature of Informant on written report
2	Exhibit - 1/1	Signature of Krishna Rai writer of written report
3	Exhibit- 1/2	Signature of Station Vijay Prasad on written Petition
4	Exhibit - 3	Signature of Vijay Prasad on formal FIR and the handwriting upon the same.
5	Exhibit - 4	Signature and handwriting of PW 04 on charge-sheet
6	Exhibit - 5	Protest Petition

B. Defence:

Sr. No	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Exhibit X	Carbon Copy of the Cremation Receipt
2	Exhibit A	Attested Photocopy of the details of cremation of deceased as mentioned in cremation register
3	Exhibit B	Letter of Deputy Registrar, Patliputra Municipal Corporation





It is the case of prosecution that the marriage of informant's daughter namely Angali Devi, resident of village Shukulpurva, Post Mohan Uddwan, PS Sohan, District Kaimur, was solemnized with Govinda Rai, s/o, Kesho Rai, Resident of Vill Kharaua, Post Karath, PS Tarari, District Bhojpur at Ara on 04.05.2018 according to Hindu rites and rituals. One month before the date of occurrence the in-laws of deceased assaulted her for demand of dowry and father in law of deceased, dropped her off to the house of informant and when the informant asked for the reason, for the same, her daughter replied to him that, she is constantly beaten and tortured by her in laws for the demand of motorcycle, a chain of gold and rupees five lac in cash as dowry. After sometime of the incident, the informant made Vidai of her daughter to her matrimonial home with dowry as per his capacity, but, the in-laws and husband of informant did not stop torturing the deceased physically and mentally for further demand of dowry. On 16.11.2021 at 06:30 am, Kesho

1. On the written report of Pramod Rai, Tarari P.S. Case No.-213/2021 lodged on 16.11.2021 u/ss 304-B, 201, 34 of I.P.C against following accused persons namely 1. Kesho Rai, 2. Govind Rai, 3. Pinku Rai, 4. Shanti Devi, 5. Pintu Rai.

JUDGMENT

Sr. No	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Exhibit C-1/CW1	N/A
C. Court Exhibits		
5	Exhibit D	Photocopy of original receipt no. 6326 Year 2021-22 dated 16.11.2021 bears signature of concerned staff namely Yogeshwar Adhikari
4	Exhibit C	Death Certificate of deceased
		Bearing Letter No. 1694 dated 10.06.2026

Rai, father in law of deceased called from mobile no. 7970738508 to the mobile no. of informant i.e. 9934347901 and informed the informant that her daughter is not well and disconnected the call. Thereafter, the informant and others reached the matrimonial house of deceased, where they came to know that, 1. Kesho Rai, 2. Govind Rai, 3. Pinku Rai, 4. Shanti Devi, and 5. Pintu Rai killed the Anjali Devi, the daughter of informant and disappeared her dead body. It has further alleged that the daughter of informant had a son and a daughter, but the informant did not find them also.

Submission of Charge-sheet and Cognizance

2. In the course of investigation statement of witnesses were recorded and after completion of investigation against this accused, it was continued further, against accused 1. Kesho Rai, 2. Pinku Rai, 3. Pintu Rai, 4. Shanti Devi and 5. Neelam Devi. In this case charge-sheet was filed vide Charge Sheet No. 44 of 2022 dated 12.03.2022 on 22.03.2022 before the court, against accused Govind Rai and after submission of charge sheet, vide order dated 19.05.2022 cognizance was taken under sections- 304-B, 201, 34 of IPC against accused namely Govind Rai and further Ld. magistrate committed the case to the court of Session after complying with section 207 of Cr.P.C. on 22.12.2022.

Charges

3. Vide order dated 15.06.2023 charges under sections 304-B/34, 302/34, 201/34 of I.P.C, settled against accused person namely Govind Rai @ Govinda Rai to which accused persons pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

Prosecution Evidences

4. In order to prove its case, prosecution has examined four witnesses namely, 1.



PW 01 - Tara Devi, mother of deceased, PW 02 - Surendra Rai, brother of deceased, PW 03 - Pramod Rai, informant and father of deceased and PW 04 - Bal Krishna Mahato, the Investigating Officer of this case.

5. P.W.-01, Tara Devi is the mother of deceased Anjali Devi and she deposed in her examination in chief that, Anjali Devi was her daughter, they got her married in 2018 with Govinda, son of Keshav Rai, resident of village Kharouna, police station Tarari and after the marriage, her daughter went to her in-laws' house and for a few days, all were fine there, but after some days her father-in-law Keshav Rai, brother-in-law Pintu Rai, Pinku Rai, husband Govinda Rai, elder sister-in-law Shanti Devi and Neelam Devi started beating her for dowry and did not even give her food. She further deposed that, they demanded five lakh rupees, three Bhar of gold (30 grams) and one vehicle, and said that she should bring all these things and once, 15 days before Diwali, Keshav Rai snatched her daughter's jewelry, beat her and dropped her at her house. PW 01, deposed that after 10-12 days Govinda Rai came and said that he would take Anjali with him and at that time whatever strength/capacity they had, they gave as much as possible and after requesting them, they sent their daughter with Govinda and on the night of 16-11-2021 all of them murdered her daughter. She further deposed that, on the next morning at 6 o'clock her daughter's father-in-law, Keshav Rai called and said that your daughter is unwell, come and take her, after that his phone became unreachable. Hearing the same, the witness, her husband Pramod Rai, her brother-in-law Kakeshwar Rai, her son Shritam Rai, her elder sister-in-law's son Rahul Rai, relative Bitu Rai, relative Sunarjit Rai, and Gouti's son



Surendra Rai went to her daughter's in-laws' house by Sitaram Singh's vehicle and motorcycles, and saw that the house was locked and the neighbors said that they had murdered the girl and disposed of the dead body. She further stated that her daughter has two children, but till now it is not known where those two children are. The witness identified that Govinda Rai is present in court and further deposed that she can also identify the other accused after seeing them.

During Cross-examination by the accused side, PW 01, stated that the in laws of her daughter started demanding dowry about one and a half years after the marriage and they demanded five lakh rupees, a three-bhar gold chain and one motorcycle. She further stated that these people used to demand dowry from her daughter and at her daughter's wedding they had given gifts etc, her daughter lived there quite well and her daughter also gave birth of two children there and they had given gifts such as a ring to the Samdhi, clothes to the Samdhan, five thousand rupees, and a gold ring. She further stated that every time they used to demand 551 rupees from the Samdhi she had not informed the police station about the dowry demand. She further stated that Keshav Rai's relative Jahaan Rai had arranged this marriage and she had told the mediator about the dowry demand. PW 01, stated that during the first one and a half years after the marriage she had not mentioned any dowry demand and after that Keshav Rai and his family members started demanding dowry. She stated that, she had given a statement at Tarari police station and she gave the statement on 16 November, whenever her daughter was beaten, she used to go to her house and village Panchayats were also held there and people



from the extended family used to be present in those Panchayats and Panchayats were held five or six times regarding the dowry demand and she cannot name all the people who had come to those Panchayats. She further stated that three months after the marriage her daughter had come to her maternal home from her in-laws' house and at that time she was fine and her in-laws did not trouble her and for one year she lived properly at her in-laws' house and after that, her daughter's in-laws started demanding dowry and whatever items the in-laws demanded, she did not give them and she had not informed the police station about this matter. She further stated that the marriage had taken place with great celebration and at that time there was no dispute and there was no dispute even at the time of Vidaai (farewell) and Keshav Rai, Pinku Rai and the people of their house used to demand dowry.

On 22.11.2024, PW 01, Tara Devi was recalled for her cross-examination and she stated in her cross-examination that, the marriage of her daughter was solemnized in May, 2018 and her daughter went to her Sasural in a happy environment, her daughter came to her parental house for two times, after her marriage. She further stated that, after the marriage and before the death of deceased any written complaint has not been submitted in the police station regarding the dowry demand made by the in laws of her daughter. She denied the suggestion of defense that, she did not give her statement before police that, brother-in-law (Bhaisur) Pinku Rai, Pintu Rai, elder sister-in-law (Jethani) Shanti Devi and Nilam Devi were demanding dowry and for fulfillment of the same they used to assault and stop food to the deceased. She further denied that, she told that earlier Panchayati were held for 5 – 6 times.



She further denied the suggestion of defense that the in-laws of her daughter did not demand dowry and they did not kill her for the same and her daughter was ill and her in laws were taken to Patna for treatment, and after her death, her cremation has conducted there i.e. in Patna.

6. PW 02 - Surendra Rai is the brother of deceased, who deposed in his

examination in chief that informant, who lodged this case is his uncle and the deceased Anjali Devi was his cousin sister, she was married to Govinda in 2018 and Govinda's father's name is Keshav Rai, resident of village Kharuana. He further deposed that after the marriage, his sister went to her in-laws' house and she stayed there properly for about one and a half years and her sister was beaten for five lakh rupees, three bhar of jewelry, and a motorcycle, and the accused persons, also did not give her food and whatever the demand made by her in laws, they could not fulfill those demands completely and in 2021, about 15 days before Diwali, Keshav Rai had brought his sister to her parental home and after that, Govinda came and took her back to his house after the customary farewell. He further deposed that eleven days later, Keshav Rai called at his aunt's house and said that their daughter is very serious and after that, Keshav Rai's mobile phone was switched off and then the witness himself, his aunt, sister Antim Kumari, cousin brother Rahul Kumar, Shriram Rai, Kameshwar Rai, and Pramod Rai went to Kharuana by vehicle. On reaching there, they saw that Govinda's house was locked and on making inquiries, villagers said that they had beaten the victim to death and her body was not found. He further stated that, his sister's two children were also not found. This witness has identified the



accused Govinda as present in court, and further deposed that, he can identify the other people as well after seeing them.

During Cross-examination on behalf of the accused, PW 02, stated that, Pramod Rai lives separately from them. Pramod Rai has five daughters and apart from the deceased Anjali, there are two elder daughters whose marriages have already been taken place, he does not remember when and where the elder sister of Anjali got married and Anjali has one brother whose marriage has not taken place. He further stated that, he has six daughters and two sons and he married one of his daughters and he performed his daughter's marriage on the 5th date of the sixth month in 2021 and the house of Anjali's father is two to four houses away from them. He further stated that their partition took place about 30 years ago and Anjali's marriage took place with consent and in a happy atmosphere, and there was no problem of any kind and Anjali went to her in-laws' house at the time of marriage. He further stated that between the marriage of Anjali and her death, she came to their parental home three to four times and returned to her in-laws' house. He stated that to take Anjali to her parental home, earlier the program was scheduled in advance and after that, she never came on her own. He further stated that nobody had told him about any dowry demand and in 2021, when he went to the in-laws' house of Anjali, then he came to know about the dowry demand and he had gone there in October 2021 and he had not informed any authority about this. He stated that as per his knowledge, before the victim's death and after the marriage, Anjali's father had also not informed anyone to anywhere and they did not get treatment for the assault of



Anjali. He stated that, the demands had started one and a half years after the marriage. Anjali had two children. The first child, a girl, was born one year after the marriage and the second child was a boy. He stated that at the time of Anjali's death, the second boy was nine months old. He stated that, Govinda's brother's name is Pintu Rai and whether he lives in the village or outside, he cannot say and they all live together. This witness has denied the suggestion of defense that, both of Anjali's children live with Pintu Rai in Daman. He further stated that, he does not know where the children are and when Keshav Rai had gone to drop Anjali at her parental home, he had spoken with him, and after 15 days Anjali's husband, Govinda Rai took her back after her vidai. He stated that, he cannot tell the phone number from which the call had come. Immediately after receiving the call, on the same day, they went to Kharuana and the call had come in the morning. He stated that the distance from his village to Kharuana is about 100 kilometers. They reached Kharuana around 11:30 in the day, and Kharuana falls under Tarari police station. He stated that he does not know the names of the people from whom they made inquiries in Kharuana, nor did he try to know their names. He stated that they had gone to Tarari police station on the same day and before giving the written report about the occurrence to the police station, the incident had been narrated to the investigating officer and the written statement was given at the police station and he had not signed that paper. He stated that his statement to the police was recorded on the same day at the police station and he does not know what the investigating officer wrote in his statement and there is no signature of him on written report. This witness



has denied the suggestion of defense that they had participated in last rites of deceased and that they were demanding her articles and he deposed falsely. He further denied the suggestion of defense that no such occurrence took place as alleged.

7. PW 03, Pramod Rai is the informant and father of victim / deceased deposed

in his examination in chief that, her daughter's name was Anjali Devi. Her marriage was solemnized in 2018 with Govinda Ray, son of Keshav Ray, in village Kharuana, and after the marriage, her daughter went to her matrimonial home and stayed there properly for about one and a half years, and after that Keshav Ray, Govinda Ray, Piku Ray, Pintu Ray, Nilam Devi and Shanti Devi started assaulting his daughter and demanding five lakh rupees, a three bhar gold chain, and a motorcycle. He further deposed that he received information in 2021 and Keshav Ray informed him on his mobile phone at 6:30 in the morning that his daughter was unwell and in a serious condition. Thereafter, when they called Keshav Rai, they found his phone was switched off. He deposed that then at about 8 in the morning, they left for Kharuana in Sitaram Singh's four-wheeler vehicle. Along with him, Tara Devi, Surendra Ray, Kameshwar Ray, Rahul Ray, Shriram Ray and Antim Kumari, and some people also went on motorcycles, when they reached Kharuana, the house was locked and after making enquiry from neighbours, they came to know that at around 12 in the night the accused persons had already taken away his daughter's dead body somewhere and however, till now the body has not been traced. He further deposed that, thereafter, he filed a case at Tarari Police Station. The report / petition was written by



Krishna Ray and he put his signature on written report, and upon identification of witness his signature has been marked as **Exhibit-1**, and signature of Krishna Ray, has been marked as **Exhibit-1/1**. This witness has identified accused Govinda Ray as present in the court, and further stated that he will also identify the other accused persons on seeing them.

During Cross-examination on behalf of the accused, this witness has stated that he has five daughters and one son, except one daughter, he has married all of them, he does not remember in which years the other daughters were married. He stated that, Anjali was his fourth daughter, and he cannot tell the name of the mother-in-law of his third daughter. He stated that except Anjali's mother-in-law, he does not remember the names of the mothers-in-law of his other daughters, and Anjali's marriage took place happily and willingly. The ceremony was also conducted in a happy atmosphere. Between 2018 and 2021, Anjali came to his house about four times and returned to her matrimonial home. He further stated that during her stay at the matrimonial home, Anjali gave birth to one son and one daughter. The younger child is a son and the elder child is a daughter. He stated that at the time, when Anjali died, the younger child was about nine months old and the daughter was about one and a half to two years old. He further stated that he does not know whether both of Anjali's children are at the matrimonial home or elsewhere. He stated that after the death of his daughter, he did not try to find out where the children were. He stated that Govinda Ray has two brothers named Piku Ray and Pintu Ray. He stated that he does not know that Pintu Ray lives in Daman and that both of Anjali's children live there with him. He further



deposed that after one and a half years of marriage, his daughter informed him about the demand for money and motorcycle when he had gone to Kharouna, during the period of one and a half years after the marriage. He has three-fourths Bighas of land, and he cultivates his land and he does not know how much land and property have his son in law, and at the time of marriage, he did not inquire about how much land and property they possessed. He further stated that the marriage was arranged by his relative Bhola Ray. Bhola Ray is a resident of Chhulkar, under Rajpur Police Station, and he does not know in which district it presently falls. He further stated that in this case, he will not be able to produce his relative Bhola Ray as a witness and after her daughter's death, he had no conversation with his brother-in-law. He further stated that after the marriage, he did not give any written complaint to any authority regarding the dowry demand and for the first time, he mentioned the dowry demand in writing only in this case. The witness has stated that in 2021, he received the information at around 6:30 in the morning through a mobile phone call and this information was given by Keshav Ray. Keshav Ray is his daughter's father-in-law. He further stated that the phone on which the information was received belongs to her wife, he cannot tell its number. PW 03 stated that phone number was not given to the police, the police did not come to his house to record his statement and he gave his statement at Tarari Police Station itself. He further stated that Sita Ram is resident of Paia village, which is about three to four kilometers away from his village. He further stated that the four-wheeler vehicle was a Bolero, but he does not remember its number and the statement of Sita Ram Singh was not recorded



by the police in this case. He further deposed that about 10-15 people went to Kharana in the four-wheeler and on motorcycles, all of them were members of his family. He further stated that in Govinda Ray's family, there were about six people who used to live in the village, including four men and two women and he has given the name of all the members of Keshav Ray's family in this case. He further stated that when he went to Kharana, no person from the village came to them; rather, they themselves approached the villagers. He further stated that apart from his samdhi's family, he does not know any person from that village and he did not try to know the names and addresses of the persons who told them about the incident and no villager from that village accompanied them to Tarari Police Station, only the persons who had come with them, from their village went to Tarari Police Station and before giving the written information, he had narrated the entire incident to the investigating officer and after hearing him, the officer told him to write it down, so he wrote it down. He further stated that after filing the case at the police station, the police never again recorded his statement. He further stated that they stayed in Kharana village for about four to five hours, he does not know Tarari Police Station is, how far from village Kharana. They went from Kharana village to the police station by vehicle. It took about half an hour to reach Tarari Police Station from Kharana village and after reaching the police station, he submitted the written information after about two to two and a half hours and during this period, he remained at the police station and he had mutual discussions and consultation regarding filing the case. This witness has denied the suggestion of defense that Govinda Ray and his



Presiding Officer : Sangam Singh
Session Trial No. 3 of 2023
Date of Judgment: 08.07.2026

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, IIIrd
BHOJPUR AT ARA

family members did not demand dowry from her daughter and that they did not murder her daughter for that reason. He further denied that after receiving the information they went to Khararuna and participated in his daughter's funeral rites. He further denied the suggestion that after the funeral rites they demanded her daughter's jewelry and, when it was not given, they filed a false case.

On 22.04.2026 this witness recalled for his deposition and in his examination in chief on this day he deposed that the Protest Petition filed by him in Tarari PS Case No. 213 of 2021 was written by his lawyer, which was not read by him, neither he made his signature upon the same, after understanding the same by hearing it, on reading the same by someone other, which is marked as **Exhibit 5**. Further he stated in his cross-examination that he told to his advocate that the meaning of protest petition is that the name of anyone should not be cut. He stated that he dose not know where he signed and he also does not know that what was written on that paper.



8.

PW 04, Bal Krishna Mahto, is the Investigating Officer of this case, he deposed in his examination in chief that, on 16-11-2021, he was posted at Tarari Police Station as a Sub-Inspector and was on duty that day. He deposed that Sri Arbind Kumar, SHO of Tarari Police Station has assigned him the investigation of Tarari P.S. Case No. 213/2021 registered under Sections 304B, 201, and 34 IPC and he was assigned to investigate against Keshav Rai, Govind Rai, Pinku Rai, Shanti Devi, Pintu Rai, and Nilam Devi, residents of village Khararuna, P.S. Tarari, District Bhojpur. He further deposed that after taking up the investigation, he re-recorded the statement of

Pinku Rai, which is entered in paragraph no. 2 of the case diary, thereafter, he recorded the statement of witness Shanti Devi and after that, he inspected the place of occurrence, which is entered in paragraph no. 6 of the case diary. This witness has deposed that, the boundaries of the place of occurrence are: in the north, a PCC road and thereafter the dilapidated house of Ayodhya Rai; to the south, the fallow land of Ranjit Rai; in the east, a one-storey house of Kariya Rai; and in the west, a PCC road. He deposed that, at the place of occurrence, he recorded the statements of witnesses Surendra Rai and Kameshwar Rai, which are entered in paragraphs nos. 7 and 8 of the case diary and all the witnesses supported the FIR. He further stated that then he left the place of occurrence and went the police station and on 21-11-2021, he left for routine patrolling duty and during that duty he reached village Kharana, which is entered in paragraph no. 14 of the case diary. Raids were conducted with the assistance of the police force, but the accused could not be found. He further deposed that on 19-01-2022, he left for evening patrolling duty and during the duty he went to village Kharana and, along with the police force, conducted a raid at the house of Govind Rai, which is entered in paragraph no. 28 of the case diary, and arrested Govind Rai from there. This witness identified Govind Rai as present in court today. He further deposed that after arresting him, he brought him to the police station. He recorded the criminal antecedents of accused Govind Rai, which are entered in paragraph no. 34 of the case diary and thereafter, on 20-01-2022, he produced accused Govind Rai before the court. After that, he was transferred from there and handed over charge to the senior clerk. He identified accused Govind Rai, as



today present in court.

During Cross-examination on behalf of the accused this witness has stated that the FIR in this case was registered at 14:45 hours on 16-11-2021 and after lodging of the formal FIR, he was assigned the investigation of the case, and after receiving the investigation charge, the first thing he did was re-
recording the informant's statement. He stated that he did not mention in the case diary, on which date and at what time he re-recorded the informant's statement. He stated that, he recorded the statements of the informant and his wife Tara Devi at the police station and the distance from Tarari Police Station to village Kharana is approximately 5 or 6 kilometers. he went to that village in the police vehicle. He stated that it is not mentioned in case diary, who pointed out the house alleged to be the place of occurrence in village Kharana. He further stated that he did not go inside the house alleged to be the place of occurrence and in this case, he did not record the statement of any person from village Kharana, nor did he make any effort to do so. He also did not record the statements of the people living around the place of occurrence and he recorded the statements of the informant's family members at the place of occurrence itself, but he did not mention the time in the case diary. He further stated that between 16-11-2021 and 21-11-2021, no investigation was conducted in this case. He received a supervision note, which directed him to record the statement of the person, in the case diary, under whose care the deceased's two children, Aarti Kumari and Sparsh Kumar, were living, is entered in paragraph no. 20 of the case diary. He stated that he did not conduct any investigation to trace those two children



and there was also a direction to make every possible effort to recover the remains of the dead body, but he did not comply with that direction either. He further stated that on 08-12-2021, he received a communication from the Superintendent of Police informing him that this was an S.R. case and that it would be supervised by the Sub-Divisional Police Officer and by that time, the supervision note of the Sub-Divisional Police Officer had already been received. He stated that nowhere in the diary during the entire investigation, it is mentioned that, when and on what date the supervision of this case took place, or whether he was present during that supervision. He stated that in paragraph no. 34 of the case diary, no criminal antecedent of accused Govind Rai was found apart from this case and before starting the investigation, he had read the written report of this case. He stated that two phone numbers are mentioned in the written report, and those phone numbers are also mentioned in the informant's re-recorded statement. He stated that no attempt was made to obtain the call details or CDRs of those two phone numbers and no effort was made to ascertain the holders of those phone numbers either. He stated that the statements of the informant and his wife were recorded at the police station, he did not verify whether they had come there on foot or by some vehicle. He stated that during the investigation, he never went to the informant's house. This witness denied the suggestion of defense that he conducted the investigation after being influenced by the informant and therefore did not conduct a fair investigation. He further denied the suggestion that although it was stated that the diary was written at a particular time, the diary-writing work was not done at that time and the diary was



written at the police station. He stated that during the entire investigation, whenever he went to the place of occurrence, he found the house locked; however, on the day Govind Rai was arrested, the house was open, but nothing related to this case was found in that house.

On 21.04.2026 this witness has recalled for his deposition and he deposed in his examination in chief that, there is signature of Vijay Prasad on written petition, which he identified and on his identification this signature has been marked as **Exhibit 1 / 2**. He further deposed that the formal FIR bears the signature of Vijay Prasad and the same is in his handwriting, which is identified by this witness and marked as **Exhibit 3**. He further deposed that charge-sheet is in his handwriting and bears his signature and on his identification the same is marked as **Exhibit 4**. In his cross-examination this witness has stated that he joined the police station in the year, 2020, he does not remember the date when he started investigation of this case from beginning of this case. He stated that the application is not in his hand and he does not recognize the handwriting of the application. He further stated that formal FIR is not in his handwriting, but it bears the signature of Vijay Prasad. He further stated that the signature of Vijay Babu on charge-sheet has been exhibited. He denied the suggestion of defense that Vijay Prasad did not sign before him and he deposed due to the reason that he is the staff of police station.

Defense Witnesses

9. DW 01 Govinda Rai @ Govinda Kumar is the husband of deceased Anjali Devi, he deposed that Anjali Devi was his wife and she died on 16.11.2021.



He further deposed that her wife was experiencing severe stomach pain and was being taken to Patna his father, Kesho Rai, called the father-in-law of this witness on 9934347901 from his phone number, 7970738508, and informed him about the occurrence and Pramod Rai and his mother-in-law, Tara Devi, were with the witness. He further deposed that his wife Anjali died on the way and after consulting with his mother-in-law and father-in-law, they performed the entire funeral rites and cremated her by cremation at the Patna Municipal Corporation's electric crematorium at Bans Ghat on 16.11.2021. He further deposed that the receipt number was 63/2021-2022 and the cremation cost was approximately 300 rupees and the receipt was prepared by Yogeshwar Adhikari and given on the same day, 16.11.2021. He further deposed that the receipt given by Yogeshwar Adhikari bears his signature, which he recognizes and the present receipt is the carbon copy of the original the original copy of receipt was given to the lawyer, but he lost it somewhere. And on identification of the witness, the carbon copy of the original receipt, marked as **Exhibit X**. This witness further deposed that he has two children from his marriage with Anjali Devi, one of them is his elder girl, named Aditi Kumari, aged 6 years, and the younger child is a boy named Mohan, aged 4 years. He further deposed that his brother, Pintu Rai—who resides in Damam & Diu—looks after these children, keeping them with him and managing their care and education.

During Cross-examination of DW 01, the witness has stated that when the stomach pain started to Anjali Devi, they did not consult any local doctor and the ambulance was a government one, and the on board staffs there were



administering IV drips; and no doctor was present with them. He further stated that he does not know whether the person administering the IV drips possessed a certificate for doing so. He further stated that he has no proof that his mother-in-law and father-in-law were with them and there is no witness either who could confirm that his mother-in-law and father-in-law were with him. He further stated that he performed the Mukha-agni (lighting of the funeral pyre). He further stated that he was in jail, and his brother lives outside; consequently, he did not meet his lawyer and he cannot say in which class his daughter studies because he was in jail and has not contact with them. He further stated that he have no proof that his brother lives in Daman & Diu. This witness denied that he deposed falsely to save themselves from this case. DW 02, Chandan Kumar is the Deputy Registrar Patliputra Municipal Corporation deposed in his examination in chief that he is presenting the original funeral register of the Bans Ghat Electric Crematorium from 13.10.2021 to 05.12.2021 and in this original register, at serial number 5215, Anjani Devi (father Pramod Rai, husband Govind Kumar), gender female (Hindu, married), age 22, caste Brahmin, permanent residence village Kharuna, Tarari police station, Bhojpur district, occupation housewife is mentioned and the deceased's full address is village Sukulpurwa, Chauri police station, Bhabua district, and date of death is 16.11.2021 at 06:00 am Place of death is Veer Dayal Emergency Hospital 70 feet road bypass Patna, Cause of death is heart attack and Name and address of last medical officer- Dr. Veer Dayal Emergency Hospital Patna, Signature of the person giving



information is Govind Kumar Mo. 7970738508 Dated 16.11.2021 Signed by employee Yugeshwar ji all the same is mentioned and the witness produced the attested photocopy of the original pages of the same register which he has obtained from the original register and is submitting it to the court after attesting the same. He further deposed that the entire details which are given by him are absolutely correct and true to his knowledge and on his identification the same is marked as **Exhibit A**. He further deposed that with reference to the entries about the all the above mentioned information he issued a letter bearing letter number 1694 dated 10.06.2026 typed out; it bears his own signature—which he recognize—and has been marked as **Exhibit B**. He further deposed that the death certificate is issued from the Planning and Development Department, Kankarbagh Circle, Patna Municipal Corporation; it bears the digital signature of the Kankarbagh Sub-Registrar—which he recognize—and was issued on 25.11.2021. The death registration number is D-2021:10-98659-002532, and the registration date is 25.11.2021; this is the death certificate of Anjali Devi. The death occurred at Veer Dayal Emergency Hospital, 70 Feet Road Bypass, Patna. The date of death is 16.11.2021. He recognize the death certificate, which has been marked as **Exhibit C**. DW 02 further deposed that it is a photocopy of the original receipt (Receipt No. 6326, Year 2021-22), issued on 16.11.2021, regarding the deceased Anjali Devi (aged 22), whose cremation was performed at the electric crematorium: the document bears the signature of Yogeshwar and was issued after verification against the original register; it is entirely correct and authentic. He recognize Yogeshwar's signature dated 16.11.2021 on it, and it has been



marked as **Exhibit D**. He further deposed that all records are certified, correct, and authentic.

During Cross-examination of DW 01, the witness has stated that Govind Kumar, the husband of Anjani Devi, stated that she had suffered a heart attack. He further stated that the cause of death for all deceased persons is recorded in that register. He stated that whatever is written in the register is recorded based solely on the information provided by the informant. He stated that he did not see any medical documents regarding a heart attack for the deceased Anjani Devi. He received the information from the court on 10.06.2026 and he has not seen the original copy of the receipt for which the photocopy was provided and Govind Kumar has not disclosed to him that a case has been lodged against him and all the information recorded in the register bases on the information provided by the concerned informers. He further stated that he present for recording his testimony by order of the court. DW 03, Akhilesh Rai is neighbour of Govinda Rai and in his examination in chief, this witness has deposed that on 16.11.2021, he was in the village. Govinda Rai is his immediate neighbor and Govinda Rai's wife was from Sukalpurva, he does not know the name of Govinda Rai's wife as Anjali Devi. Anjali Devi has passed away, she died due to stomach pain. He deposed that when Manthan Rai, he himself, and others arrived there, they saw her writhing in pain due to the stomach ache and Govinda informed his mother-in-law via phone, and Govinda and his father set off for Patna with Anjali Devi in an ambulance. He further deposed that as there was no space in the ambulance, they followed behind in a private vehicle and they met Govinda's



in-laws on the way. He further deposed that she passed away just as they were nearing the hospital and after her death, the cremation took place at the Bans Ghat electric crematorium in the presence of Govinda, his in-laws, and all of them. He deposed that Govinda and his wife have two children, Govinda's brother, Pintu, looks after the upbringing of those children and after the cremation, Manthan Rai, Govinda's in-laws, and this witness returned to the village. He further deposed that upon returning, he came to know that these people had filed a legal case to reclaim their belongings and to take back the boy and the girl.

During Cross-examination of DW 03, the witness has stated that Govinda Rai is his neighbor and nephew by relation. He stated that Govinda had informed his mother-in-law and father-in-law using his mobile phone; he does not know their numbers and he also cannot provide the ambulance number. He further stated that he met Govinda's mother-in-law and father-in-law in Patna, he had gone to Patna traveled by vehicle. He further stated that he does not know whose vehicle it was and he does not know the name of the driver. He stated that he became aware that the deceased was suffering from stomach pain because she told me so, and he does not hold any medical degree to conduct examinations. This witness has denied the suggestion of prosecution that he deposed falsely due to the reason that he is neighbour of Govinda Rai. 12. DW 04, Mandhar Rai is neighbour of Govinda Rai and in his examination in

chief, this witness has deposed that on 16.11.2021, he was in the village. Govinda Rai's wife was unwell, she had stomach pain. He deposed that they called for a car, or ambulance and Govinda Rai called his mother-in-law and



father-in-law, saying, "They're on their way, please come." They followed. When they arrived, they found both parties present. He deposed that she had died on the way and both parties insisted on cremating her there, so she was cremated in the electric crematorium. He deposed that there was no dispute before the marriage and the spouse had a son and a daughter from the marriage. He deposed that Anjali's brother-in-law takes care of them. He deposed that after the cremation, Anjali's parents and the witness and others returned to the village. He deposed that they filed a lawsuit seeking custody of Sir Samya and the two children and the two children live with Govinda's elder brother in Daman & Deu. This witness has deposed that whatever testimony he gave today was given voluntarily, without any pressure and he has stated everything which he saw.

During Cross-examination of DW 04, the witness has stated that both parties were present in Patna and both parties were present at Bangghat. He stated that on the girl's side, her mother, her father, and one other man were present. He stated that he recognize her mother and father and he might not be able to recognize the mother-in-law and father-in-law if he saw them. He stated that he also went to the cremation site, he cannot describe the boundaries of the electric crematorium at Bangghat; it was his first time there. This witness has denied the suggestion of prosecution that he deposed falsely due to the reason that he is neighbour of Govinda Rai.

13. On 27.04.2026 statement of the accused Govind Rai recorded u/s 313 Cr.P.C. in which he denied the occurrence and claimed to be innocent and accused person not led any defense evidence.



14. Ld. counsel for the state has submitted during argument that informant is father of the deceased and FIR was lodged by him promptly. All the prosecution witnesses have fully supported the case of prosecution and in their cross-examination the defense has failed to elicit any fact from the witnesses, which adversely affects the case of prosecution. There is no material inconsistency in the evidence of prosecution witnesses. The evidence adduced by the defense can't be relied upon as there is material inconsistency in the evidence of the witnesses. The death of the victim was occurred within seven years of her marriage and she was subjected to the mental and physical harassment by the accused for not fulfilling the demand of dowry. Thus the prosecution has succeeded in proving its case beyond all reasonable doubt.

15. The Ld. Counsel for the defense submitted during argument that the daughter of the informant died due to illness and the accused has tried his best to save her life and his wife died when she was taking to the doctor the parents of the deceased was also with her daughter and when she died before reaching the hospital, then the accused and the parents of the deceased decided to cremate her in the Patna. The cremation certificate alongwith the receipt, the death certificate have been exhibited by the defense, no adverse view / conclusion has been taken from the defense evidence. The daughter of the informant died her natural death. She left behind her two children at present, they are living with the brother of the accused as he is in custody since, four and half years. The fact of demanding dowry by the accused has not been proved beyond all reasonable doubt by the prosecution. Since, the parents of the deceased



16. wanted the custody of both grand children and also wanted all the variable articles with were given by him to the accused at the time of marriage of his daughter and due to that this false case has been lodged by the informant. There are material inconsistencies in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses which can not be relied upon thus the accused deserve acquittal. Now, the point of determination is that whether the prosecution has become able to prove its case against the accused beyond shadow of reasonable doubt or not?

FINDINGS

17. This case has been lodged for the dowry death of the informant's married daughter and the accused after killing his daughter caused disappear her dead body. In this case the informant is father of the deceased and the information was given by her father in law regarding illness of his married daughter at 06:30 AM on 16.11.2021 at that time he was in his village Sukulpurva situated at Bhabhua (Kaimur) which is about 120 kilometers from Ara and the FIR was lodged at about 02:45 PM on the same day. This fact is admitted that the marriage of the daughter of the informant was solemnized with the accused on 04.05.2018 and she died on 16.11.2021, meaning thereby within seven years of her marriage, her death was unnatural.

18. In order to attract application of section 304-B, the essential ingredients are:-
(i) The death of a woman should be caused by burns or bodily injury or otherwise than under normal circumstances.

(ii) Such a death should have occurred within seven years of her marriage.

(iii) She must have been subjected to cruelty or harassment by her husband or



Presiding Officer : Sangam Singh
Session Trial No. 3 of 2023
Date of Judgment: 08.07.2026

any relative of her husband.
(iv) Such cruelty or harassment should be for, or in connection with, demand of dowry.
(v) Such cruelty or harassment is shown to have been meted out to the woman soon before her death

19. Firstly, we will analysis the evidence of prosecution regarding the demand of

dowry as well as the deceased was subjected to cruelty for not fulfilling the demand of dowry. In the FIR, it has been specifically stated by the informant that about one month before her death the father of the accused left his daughter at his house for not fulfilling the demand of dowry and when the informant asked his daughter then she told him that the family members of her matrimonial home always harass her for not fulfilling the demand of dowry and she specifically told about the articles which they demanded and after some days the accused came his house and took his daughter with him and thereafter, on 16.11.2021 they informed that the condition of his daughter is serious. The informant proved his signature on the written report, which is Exhibit-1 and also proved the signature of the person who had written it, which is Exhibit-1 / 1 and the signature of the police officer who has registered the first information report as 213/2021 dated 16.11.2021 u/s 304-B / 201 of IPC and the formal FIR is Exhibit 3, which is proved by the investigating officer, who is prosecution witness no. 4. The informant who is PW 03, has specifically stated in his evidence that after one and half years of the marriage of his daughter the accused and his family members started demanding cash and certain valuable articles as dowry. And she was also



subjected to cruelty for not fulfilling the demand of dowry, his daughter used to give information of the cruel behaviour of the family members of her matrimonial home including the accused for the demand of dowry by her phone. This witness has also stated that in this regard 5 - 6 times the Panchayati was held between both the parties. This witness was given suggestion by the defense that he did not file any complain before the police for demanding dowry and harassment of his daughter against the accused. In this regard it is important to note that, this fact is very natural that the informant being a villager did not inform the police about the this demand of dowry and the harassment of his daughter because he tried to resolve this issue at his best and all the traditional methods were used by him just like Panchayati. And the real fact is that if he had informed the police about all these things and if police intervene, the family members of matrimonial home of her daughter make her life very miserable, that's why normally father of a married girl initially never approaches the police to resolve the issue of dowry and harassment and in this case also, the informant did not resort to all these methods. The defense has cross-examined this witness at length but did not elicit any such fact which adversely affects the case of prosecution on this point prove any fact so that the adverse inference could be drawn about the reliability of the witness. Thus, the evidence of this witness is cogent, clinching, natural and reliable on this point. PW 01 who is mother of the deceased fully supported the case of prosecution regarding the demand of dowry by the accused and his family members and harassment of her daughter by those persons for not fulfilling the demand of dowry. The



evidence of this witness is intact in the cross-examination and this witness was recalled by the defense, but her evidence remained intact. The defense has cross-examined this witness at length but did not elicit any such fact which adversely affects the case of prosecution or prove any fact so that the adverse inference could be drawn about the reliability of the witness regarding the evidence about the demand of dowry and harassment for not fulfilling the demand of dowry. Thus, the evidence of this witness is cogent, clinching, natural and reliable on this point. In these circumstances the fact regarding demand of dowry by the accused and the harassment of the deceased for not fulfilling the demand of dowry that was continued soon before her death, is fully proved by the prosecution. In these circumstances presumption u/s 113 B of Indian Evidence Act, 1872 shall be applied.

20. Section 113B of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 reads as follows:-

"113B: Presumption as to dowry death -

When the question is whether a person has committed the dowry death of a woman and it is shown that soon before her death such woman has been subjected by such person to cruelty or harassment for, or in connection with, any demand for dowry, the Court shall presume that such person had caused the dowry death. Explanation-For the purposes of this section dowry death shall have the same meaning as in Section 304-B of the Indian Penal code (45 of 1860)".

21. To rebut the presumption u/s 113 B of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 the defence has examined four witnesses including the accused and made exhibited some documents. In its evidence, the defense has tried to prove that



the daughter of the informant, who is wife of the accused was seriously ill having complain of acute stomach pain and the accused was taking her to the hospital and before reaching there she died on the way. The parents of the deceased were informed and they also accompanied with him and after death of her daughter they decided together to cremate her in electric cremation situated at 'Bansh Ghat' in Patna and thereafter, they went away and lodged this false case for custody of both grand children and recovery of the articles, which were given at the time of marriage. The accused in his evidence stated that the daughter of the informant died due to severe pain in her stomach on 16.11.2021 and the informant, who is father of the deceased was informed by his father, about the serious condition of the deceased on 16.11.2021. In his evidence he did not disclose the time when his father informed the informant. The prosecution has proved this fact that on 16.11.2021 at about 06:30 AM father in law of the deceased has informed the informant on his phone about the illness of his daughter. The accused has also stated in his evidence that when he was taking his wife to the hospital his in laws were with him and the drip was giving to his wife while going to the hospital but she died on the way and with the consent of his in laws she was cremated in electric crematorium and the receipt bearing no. 63/2021-22 was issued by one Yogeshwar Adhikari and the carbon copy of such receipt was exhibited as Exhibit-X. He has further stated in his evidence that he has two children out of the wedlock, one is girl child and other is a boy and after his arrest in this case both the children are being taken care of by his brother Pintu Rai. who resides Daman & Diu He also stated that when his wife was suffering from



severe stomach pain, he did not consult any local doctor. The DW 02, produced the original register in which there were entries of the persons, who were cremated in the electric crematorium situated at 'Bansh Ghat' Patna and he has further stated that at serial no. 5215 there are full details of the deceased, name of her father and name of her husband and her age, etc. These facts have also been mentioned that date of death is 16.11.2021 at about 06:00 AM, place of death is Vir Dayal Emergency Hospital, 70 Fit Road, Bypass Patna, cause of death is Heart Attack, the name of the person who has given all these information is Govinda Kumar, Mobile No. 7970738508 dated 16.11.2021 and against this column there is signature of employee Yogeshwar and the certified copy of the original has been filed and exhibited as **Exhibit A**. The letter issued by Sub Registrar, Birth and Death, Patliputra Circle, Patna Nagar Nigam, Patna which is **Exhibit B** having all the details which are in **Exhibit A** (Register) and **Exhibit C** is the Death Certificate issued by Kankarbagh Circle, Patna Nagar Nigam. DW 03 & 04, supported the case of defense and stated that they had also gone on 16.11.2026 and were present at the place of electric crematorium where the daughter of informant was cremated. DW 03 & 04, both the witness stated in their evidence that in laws of the accused were also present at the time of cremation.

22. As per prosecution the informant received the information on his phone, which was given to him by the father of the accused from his phone, that his daughter is seriously ill and thereafter the phone of the father in law of the deceased was switched off. When the informant got this information on his phone, he was in his village situated in Bhabhua (Kaimur) District, which is



about 120 kilometers from the village of the accused. The time of receiving such information is 06:30 AM and the informant alongwith some other persons reached the matrimonial home of his daughter at about 11:30 AM and found the door of the house of accused in locked condition. When he made enquiry from the willingness then he came to know that in the intervening night of 15 - 16.11.2021 after killing the daughter of the informant, the accused and his family members took her away. After getting this information he went to the police station and lodged the FIR and the time of giving information and lodging the FIR is 02:45 PM on the same day. As per defense evidence the time of death of the deceased is 06:00 AM on 16.11.2021 meaning thereby at the time of giving information to the informant about the illness of his daughter, she had already died and the false information about the serious illness was given to the informant. Then a question arises, why this false information was given? No any explanation in this regard has been offered or given in the evidence of the defense. The accused, who is DW 01 has stated in his evidence that when he was taking his wife to the hospital due to her serious condition, at that time, his in laws were also with him. There is material contradiction in the evidence of DW 01, as on 16.11.2026 the informant received information on his phone about the illness of his daughter at 06:30 AM at his village situated in district Bhabhua (Kaimur) and this fact has not been contradicted by the defense and the distance between his village and the matrimonial house of the daughter of informant is about 120 kilometers as per evidence of PW 02, who is cousin brother of the deceased and also went to the matrimonial home of the deceased alongwith the parents



of the deceased and other persons They reached there at about 11:30 a.m. and finding the house in locked position the informant made enquiry and he came to know from the villagers about unnatural death of his daughter, then he went to the Tarari Police Station and the time of lodging the first information report is 14:45. Then it is impossible for the parents of the deceased to accompany with the accused, when he was allegedly taking his wife to the hospital.

23. The accused who is DW 01, has also stated in his evidence, that his wife had

an acute pain in her stomach and he was taking to her at Patna to consult the doctor, rather consulting any doctor nearby his village or any other hospital situated in the district Ara or in the way to Patna. This fact is very unnatural and impractical that if, wife of the accused had any acute pain in her stomach then the accused will prefer to go to any such hospital situated about 65 - 70 kilometers far from his village, which takes approximately 1 and 1/2 to 2 hours for reaching there. Whereas, the place where the accused resided there were many hospitals, doctors, primary health centers nearby Tarari Block and in Ara City. Moreover, while on the way to the Patna there were many hospitals are situated. The time of going to Patna has not been given by the defence and it was given in the defense evidence that the alleged emergency hospital situated in Patna, where he was taking to his wife for her treatment was also not a very reputed hospital for taking risk to consult there for the acute pain in the stomach of his wife. The above theory of the accused is totally false and bull story and can not be relied upon. It has also been come in the defense evidence that the wife of the accused has died of



Heart Attack. In this regard, it is admitted fact that the deceased was a rural married girl, aged about 22 years, having two children and has no any previous medical history for such type of disease, and the fact that the deceased has a nine month breast feeding child. In these circumstances, it can not be believed that the daughter of the informant died due to Heart Attack. Thus, the accused has failed to rebut the presumption u/s 113-B of the Indian Evidence Act

24.

From the above analysis of the evidence adduced by the prosecution, it has succeeded in proving its case against the accused beyond all reasonable doubts. At the same time the prosecution has successfully proved the charges under section 304-B and 201 of IPC against the accused Govind Rai @ Govinda Rai and consequently he is convicted of the charges under section 304-B and 201 of the Indian Penal Code. The decision was pronounced and signed by me in open Court. This record is fixed on 13.07.2026 for hearing on the point of sentence.

Dictated and corrected by Me

Additional Sessions Judge, Mird,
Bhojpur at Ara
08.07.2026

(Sangam Singh)
Additional Sessions Judge, Mird,
Bhojpur at Ara
08.07.2026



Hearing on the point of sentence

14.07.2026

Earlier this case was fixed for hearing on point of sentence on 13.07.2026, but on that date it could not be passed and the next date for hearing on point of sentence is fixed on today i.e. 14.07.2026.

The convict Govind Rai @ Govinda Rai was produced from Jail. Ld. advocates for the defence and Addl. Public Prosecutor appeared and were heard on the point of sentence.

The Id. Counsel for the convict Govind Rai @ Govinda Rai states that this is the first conviction of the accused and he has no criminal history. The Ld. counsel for the convict further states that the convict has two children and since the convict is in custody, they both are residing with his elder brother, who is living in Daman & Diu and prays for taking lenient view while awarding the sentence.

The Ld. APP, submits that the convict should be awarded maximum punishment because he after killing his wife, secretly cremated her in Patna, so that her cause of death could not be ascertained.

Heard both the parties. After examining the record, the Court finds that

the accused has been convicted under Sections 304-B and 201 of the Indian Penal Code for murdering his wife and also causing disappearance her deadbody. Parents of the deceased could not see her last time and also not participated in her cremation. The convict being the husband of the deceased owed a moral as well as legal responsibility towards his wife. The young bride must have left her parental house with dreams in her eyes, which however, could not be fulfilled and were shattered when demand of dowry was made for a motorcycle, a chain of gold and rupees five lac in cash, which continued till her death within three years of the marriage and the



Presiding Officer : Sangam Singh
Session Trial No. 3 of 2023
Date of Judgment: 08.07.2026

manner in which she was secretly cremated, the convict does not deserve any leniency while awarding the sentence.

Hence the convict Govind Rai @ Govinda Rai is sentenced to life imprisonment and fine of Rs.20,000/ (Twenty Thousand rupees) u/s 304-B of the Indian Penal Code and in default of payment of fine, additional imprisonment of 02 (two) years. And convict Govind Rai @ Govinda Rai is further sentenced to 02 (two) years rigorous imprisonment and fine of Rs. 5,000/ (five thousand rupees) under Section 201 of Indian Penal Code and in default of payment of fine, additional imprisonment of 03 (three) months. All the sentences of the convict Govind Rai @ Govinda Rai will run concurrently.

The sentence of the convict was dictated, read out and signed in open court.

(Dictated and corrected by me)

(Sangam Singh)
Distt. & Addl. Sessions Judge-III,
Bhojpur at Ara.
Dated: 14.07.2026

(Sangam Singh)
Distt. & Addl. Sessions Judge-III,
Bhojpur at Ara.
Dated: 14.07.2026

