

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34312 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-185 Year-2023 Thana- DUMRA District- Sitamarhi

=====

Hari Narayan Rai @ Gorakh Rai S/o Late Gyani Rai @ Dhodhi Lal Rai R/o
Village- Bhaluaha, P.S.-Dumra, Distt.- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Rina Sinha, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 03-06-2025 Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and Learned
APP for the State.

2. The present criminal miscellaneous application has been filed under Sections 483 and 484 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the BNSS, 2023’) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner who is in custody in connection with Dumra P.S. Case No. 185 of 2023, lodged on 08.04.2023, under Sections 302/304B/201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against four named accused persons including the present petitioner against whom there is allegation of dowry death.



4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Counsel submits that petitioner is father-in-law and he is residing separately with his son and daughter-in-law. He has no concern with the family of the deceased daughter-in-law and his son. He submits that the only unfortunate part of the petitioner is that he is involved in two criminal cases under Section 304B of the Indian Penal Code itself. In one of such cases he has been acquitted and in another case he is on bail. Counsel submits that petitioner is in custody since 10.01.2025. He further submits that anticipatory bail application of the son of the petitioner has been rejected. Counsel further submits that petitioner is ready to fulfill all the conditions whatsoever shall be imposed upon him.

5. Learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the father is involved in three cases of Section 304B of the Indian Penal Code though in one case he has been acquitted but criminal antecedent of same nature shows the behaviour and activity of the family of the petitioner.

6. In this background, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Hence, the prayer for regular bail of



the petitioner is hereby refused. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner that he may renew his prayer for bail three months after framing of the charge.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

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

