

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12164 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-79 Year-2024 Thana- BAHERA District- Darbhanga

=====

Ram Saran Das @ Ram Saran Tanti S/O Late Bachchalal Das R/O Village-
Kathbana, P.S- Bahera, District- Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Satrohan Das S/O Late Faguni Das R/O Vill.- Sanaur Gandhwar, P.S- Sakri,
Dist- Madhubani

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mritunjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umanath Mishra, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

3 19-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Bahera P.S. Case No. 79 of 2024 dated 10.03.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 201 and 120B of the I.P.C.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioners and the co-accused persons are alleged to have killed the daughter of the informant due to non-fulfillment of demand of Rs. 2,00,000/- as dowry. Further, the petitioner and the co-accused persons cremated the dead body in hurry, with an intention to destroy the evidence, without informing the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in



this case. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioners who is the husband of the deceased. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the deceased. It is submitted that the deceased was not subjected to torture and cruelty soon before her death for or in connection with demand of dowry. The other co-accused person has been granted regular bail by this court vide order dated 19.02.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 78175/2024. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased. It is further submitted that the informant daughter died at her matrimonial home. It is further submitted that the petitioner and the co-accused persons have cremated the dead body of the informant's daughter with an intention to destroy the evidence without informing the informant.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the heinous nature of allegation against the petitioner, I am of the view that no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. The petition is rejected and the petitioner is directed to surrender to the Court below within six weeks from the date of this order and the Court below may consider the prayer of the bail of the petitioner in accordance with law and on its own



merits without being prejudice by this order.

7. This application stands rejected.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

atul/-

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

