

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11207 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-180 Year-2024 Thana- SARAIYA District- Muzaffarpur

Randhir Kumar Son of Sikandar Rai @ Sikindra Ray Resident of Village-
Basudeo Patti, P.S.- Saraiya, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Pranav Kumar, Adv Mr. Rajeev Ranjan No. II, Adv Mrs. Priyanka Kumari, Adv
for the Informant	:	M. Santosh Kumar, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Kalyan Shankar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 18-06-2025 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the informant as well as learned A.P.P for the State.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Saraiya P.S. Case No. 180 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable u/s 304B, 201 read with Section 34 of the I.P.C.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner and the co-accused persons are alleged to have tortured the informant's daughter mentally and physically due to non-fulfillment of demand of Rs. 1,00,000/- and a motorcycle as dowry. It was also alleged that on 14.04.2024, the informant came to know that the named accused persons including the petitioner have killed her



daughter. Thereafter, the informant along with her son went to the in-laws' house of her daughter and found the dead body of her daughter kept at the door and after seeing the dead body her son became unconscious and taking advantage of the same the dead body was made to disappear and the same was disposed of.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the informant and other family members had participated in the cremation and only on account of some personal dispute the present case has been lodged. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent and is in custody since 17.07.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and have stated that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased and there is specific allegation against him of killing the daughter of the informant, hence, he does not deserve the liberty of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions of the parties and also considering the materials on record as well as the period of custody, let the petitioner above-named, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount



each to the satisfaction of learned Court concerned, Muzaffarpur, in connection with Saraiya P.S. Case No. 180 of 2024, subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors will be close relative of the petitioner.

(ii) The petitioner will remain present on each and every date fixed by the Court below, if so required by the learned Trial Court.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be canceled by the Court concerned.

(iv) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

7. The application stands allowed.

8. However, the observations made by this Court while granting the bail should not be taken into account during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Jyoti/-

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

