

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36767 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-250 Year-2023 Thana- NOORSARAI District- Nalanda

Ravindra Kumar Son of Sri Saryug Yadav Village -Balchand Bigha, P.s-
Noorsarai, District -Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajay Thakur, Adv. Ms.Vaishnavi Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Md. Shakir Ahmad, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

3 25-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Noorsarai P.S. Case No. 250 of 2023 dated 05.06.2023 registered for the offences punishable u/ss 302, 498A read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner and the co-accused persons are alleged to have strangled the informant's sister to death and also administered poison to her due to non-fulfillment of demand of motorcycle and money as dowry and the dead body of the deceased was thrown in a deserted place on the back side of the Khalihan.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner is the husband of the deceased and he has no



concern with the alleged offence. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the informant's sister. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged offence. The charge-sheet has been submitted against the petitioner. The petitioner has two criminal antecedents as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is in custody since 27.12.2024.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the bail petition of the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased. It is further submitted that the co-accused persons killed the informant's daughter by throttling due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry. As per the impugned order, the informant and the witnesses in para 3, 4, 7, 8 and 17 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the heinous nature of allegation against the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above-named on bail.

8. The application stands rejected.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Gautam/-

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

