

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18663 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-222 Year-2024 Thana- CHANDI District- Bhojpur

1. Manoj Yadav @ Manoj Kumar Yadav S/O Late Lal Mohar Yadav R/O Village- Bishunpura, PS- Chandi, District- Bhojpur
2. Ashok Yadav @ Ashok Kumar Yadav S/O Late Lal Mohar Yadav R/O Village- Bishunpura, PS- Chandi, District- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bibhakar Tiwary- Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Binod Kumar- A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Nagadeo Choubey- Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of his arrest in Chandi P. S. Case No.222 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80, 238 and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that her daughter was married to Ajay Yadav on 14.05.2022, after marriage, her daughter was being tortured for a chain, thus alleges that all the



accused persons including the petitioners killed her daughter for non-fulfilment of the demand and disposed of the dead body and are threatening to compromise the case.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant being brother of the husband of the deceased. It is next submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence and the entire allegation hinges around suspicion. It is further submitted that during the course of investigation, the husband of the deceased was arrested, who confessed that the victim committed suicide and thereafter he disposed of the dead body and thereafter, informed his family members, as such, it is submitted that even family members were not aware that the victim has committed suicide and it was only when the husband of the deceased disclosed to them that they came to know.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant as well as learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that it does not appear probable that the husband of the deceased single handedly would have carried the dead body and disposed it of. It is submitted that until and unless, the husband of the deceased got help from his family members, the dead body could not have been disposed of. It is



also submitted that if the husband or his family members were not involved in the occurrence, in that event, they would not have disposed of the dead body with a view to conceal the evidence rather would have sent the body for post mortem.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

