

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5543 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-178 Year-2023 Thana- MOUZAHDIPUR District- Bhagalpur

Prashant Deep S/O Shyam Sundar Chaudhary R/O Village- Kodadih, P.S-
Jasidih, Distt.- Deoghar (Jharkhand).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. N. K. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate Mr. Pravin Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Khurshid Anwar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4 23-06-2025 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner,

learned APP for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Mojahidpur P.S. Case No. 178 of 2023, instituted for the
offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 306, 120(B) of the
Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, daughter of
the informant committed suicide due to the torture made upon
her by her in-laws for non-fulfillment of dowry.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the
present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case.
Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the



petitioner is husband of the informant. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that the deceased was residing separately in R.P.F. quarter, Bhagalpur and the occurrence also took place in her quarter and nobody was present there in her room. The petitioner was also not present at the place of occurrence. The petitioner is in custody since 12.11.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner of demanding dowry and giving life threats to the deceased for non-fulfillment of dowry. It is further submitted that the petitioner along with other co-accused persons conspired together and forced her to hang herself. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from the date of receipt/production, the



petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the
Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

