

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17282 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-177 Year-2023 Thana- JAMHOR District- Aurangabad

Ashish Ranjan Kumar Singh @ Ashish Ranjan Kumar Son of Pushpendra
Singh R/O Village - Jiwan Bagh, P.S.- Jamhore, District - Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mukul Kumari, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Zainul Abedin, App.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Santosh Kumar Pandey, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 11-04-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. This application, for grant of regular bail, arises out
of Jamhore PS case no. 177 of 2023, disclosing offences
punishable under Sections 304(B), 201/34 of the Indian Penal
Code

3. The prosecution story, as per the First Information
Report, is that on 22.02.2023, the petitioner was married to the
informant's sister and only 15 days of the marriage, she was
subjected to cruelty on account of demand of dowry. It is
alleged that in March, 2023, she was administered poison by her
husband (petitioner) but anyhow, she recovered. On 27.08.2023,
informant came to know that his sister has died. When he made



enquiry, it came to light that on 26.08.2023, his sister fell ill and she was taken to Varanasi for treatment where she died. Thereafter, the petitioner took the dead body to Kutumba (Aurangabad) instead of vill- Jiwan Bagh (Aurangabad) and informed informant's uncle but when his uncle reached there, they took away the dead body to Vill-Jiwan Bagh and cremated the same.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case, inasmuch as F.I.R. has been lodged after 07 days of the occurrence, as the occurrence took place on 26.08.2023 and F.I.R. has been lodged on 01.09.2023. Brother of the deceased is not an eye witness and he has not supported the prosecution story. Learned counsel further submits that deceased has died due to illness during treatment. Petitioner is husband who took all possible steps for treatment of the deceased.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and submits that the deceased died at her matrimonial home only after six months of her marriage, in suspicious condition.

6. I have heard learned counsels for the parties and perused the materials available on record. The petitioner is



husband of the deceased. Just after six months of the marriage, deceased has died in her matrimonial home in suspicious condition. There is specific allegation of demand of dowry. During investigation, it has come to light that deceased was brought dead in the hospital. The deceased has died unnatural death within 07 years of her marriage. The nature of the death is not important whether it is homicidal, suicidal or accidental. There is presumption against the accused persons under Section 113-A and 113-B of the Evidence Act, 1872.

7. Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts and nature of allegation, I am not inclined to grant petitioner, the privilege of regular bail.

8. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

9. However, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after a period of one year if the trial does not show much progress.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

