

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35496 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-269 Year-2022 Thana- KHANPURA District- Samastipur

Jitendra Ram @ Jitendra Kumar Ram Son of Suresh Ram Resident of Village
- Jahangirpur, Kothiya, P.S. - Khanpur, District - Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dilip Kumar Roy, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

4 03-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S.T. No.
163 of 2023 arising out of Khanpur P.S. Case No. 269 of 2022
instituted for the offences under Sections 304B/34 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, the accusation against the
accused persons including the petitioner is of torturing and
ultimately committing murder of the Informant's daughter for
non-fulfillment of dowry demand.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged
against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case



due to dirty village politics. The petitioner is the husband of the deceased and has never demanded any dowry from the deceased or from the Informant. He further submits that the deceased has hung herself and the petitioner has no role in the alleged occurrence. The doctor has not found any external injury upon the deceased. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitsthat the charges have been framed under Sections 498A/34, 304B/34, 302/34 of the I.P.C. and Section 3/4 of the D.P. Act. Three witnesses have also been examined as of now. He further submits that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and is languishing in judicial custody since 09.11.2022 without any rhymes or reason.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Charge-sheet has been submitted under Sections 498A/304B/34 of the I.P.C. and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. The witnesses have also corroborated the allegations made in the F.I.R. The petitioner is the husband and, hence, he does not deserve bail.

6. Pursuant to the order of this Court, the learned



court below has sent its report dated 20.03.2025, stating therein that three out of ten witnesses have been examined and the expected duration that will take to conclude the trial is about six months.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence as also taking into account that the status report sent by the learned court below, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of six months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of six months as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below which will be disposed of on its merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

