

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18931 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-44 Year-2024 Thana- CHAKAND District- Gaya

=====

Jitendra Yadav @ Jitendar Yadav Son of Ramprit Yadav Resident of Village -
Meharwanpur, P.S.- Chakand, District -Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Durgesh Nandan
For the State : Ms. Anita Kumari

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

4 11-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in Chakand
P.S. Case No. 44 of 2024 registered under Sections 341, 323,
325, 498(A), 504, 506/ 34 of the IPC.

3. As per prosecution case, marriage of the deceased was
solemnized with the petitioner 14 years prior to the occurrence.
She gave birth to a blind child. Thereafter, the behaviour of
matrimonial inmates became hostile and they started torturing
her. They envaded the treatment of the deceased. The informant
got information that accused persons had confined his sister in a
room. The informant rushed to matrimonial house of his sister
and found his sister injured. He shifted her in AIMS (Abhay



Institute of Medical Science) for treatment where she died in course of treatment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. It has further been submitted that the deceased has died after two and a half months, during the treatment and the independent witness who is a co-villager, did not supported the prosecution case.

5. Learned APP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. The informant brought her sister in an injured condition and admitted her in hospital where she died but it has been alleged that the petitioner and his family members were inflicting torture upon the victim (the deceased).

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, in my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

priyanka/-

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

