

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36744 of 2025

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

Guddu Rai @ Bigu Rai S/o Harinarayan Rai Resident of Village- Bhaluaha,
P.S.- Durma, District- 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 : Mr. Rina Sinha, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 18-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Dumra
P.S. Case No. 185 of 2023 instituted for the offence under
Sections 302, 304(B), 201 & 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

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

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner
that the petitioner is in custody since 08-03-2025. Petitioner
bears two criminal antecedents, out of which he is acquitted in
one case, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail
application.



5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioner is the brother-in-law of the deceased. He is separate in mess and property from the husband of the deceased. He submits that the only unfortunate part of the petitioner is that he is involved in two criminal cases under Section 304B of the IPC itself.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that petitioner is involved in two cases of Section 304B of the IPC though he has been acquitted in one case, but criminal antecedent of the same nature shows the behavior and activity of the family of the petitioner. Bail of the father-in-law of the deceased has been rejected by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 03-06-2025, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 34312 of 2025 with a liberty to renew his prayer after framing of charge.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, taking into account his criminal antecedent that too of the similar nature, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer is *rejected*.

8. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer of bail in the court below three months after



framing of the charge.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

