

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16519 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-103 Year-2024 Thana- Champanagar District- Purnia

Mitthu Mahto @ Mitthu Kumar S/o Phulchand Mahto R/o Village- Singhiya
Harma Tola Ward No. 11, P.S.- Champanagar, District- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pawan Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mrs. Meena Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 24-06-2025 Heard Mr. Pawan Kumar, the learned counsel

appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mrs. Meena Singh, the

learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Champanagar P.S. Case No. 103 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80(2) and 3(5) of B.N.S., 2023.

3. The prosecution case is to the effect that the daughter of the informant was married to Mitthu Mahto (petitioner) around six months back. It is further alleged that after the marriage, the in-laws of the daughter of the informant including the petitioner used to demand dowry of Rs. 5,00,000/- and other goods. It has further been alleged that on 10.11.2024 at around 10'Clock, the informant received a call and was informed that her daughter was murdered by strangulation. The



informant reached the place of occurrence and did not find any of the in-laws of her daughter and her body was placed on the veranda and hence the FIR.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case merely on suspicion. It has further been submitted that the allegation of demand of dowry is concocted and no such demand was ever made and neither there is any complain with regard to the same. The learned counsel has next submitted that from perusal of the postmortem report, though the cause of death has been shown to be asphyxia due to smothering, however, there were signs on the neck of the deceased of committing suicide by hanging herself. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent and he is in custody since 12.11.2024.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and has stated that the petitioner being the husband was answerable for the death of his wife and especially taking into account the conduct of the petitioner and other family members who were not found at the place of occurrence when the informant reached there and hence he does not deserve the liberty of bail.



6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and taking into account the postmortem report, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is rejected.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Siwani/-

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

