

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43589 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-506 Year-2024 Thana- MADHAURAH District- Saran

Vikash Tiwari Son of Dilip Tiawri R/O Village- Mubarakpur, Ward No.- 07,
P.S.- Marhaura, District- Saran, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vikash Kumar Pankaj, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Aditya Pandey, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

4 13-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State, learned counsel for the informant and perused
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Marhaurah P.S. Case No. 506 of 2024, instituted for the offences
punishable under Sections 80(2), 238(a), 3(5) of the Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, read with Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry
Prohibition Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that daughter of
the informant has been done to death by the petitioner along
with other co-accused persons for non-fulfillment of demand of
dowry.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is husband of the deceased. No specific allegation of ill-treatment or harassment regarding dowry against the petitioner rather the allegation levelled against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that the petitioner was not present at the time of occurrence and the deceased has committed suicide. The petitioner is in custody since 19.09.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that there is specific allegation levelled against the petitioner of committing murder of the deceased for non-fulfillment of dowry. In paragraph nos. 7, 8 and 9 of the case diary, the witnesses have supported the prosecution case. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. As per report of the trial dated 23.09.2025 sent by the learned Court below, it transpires that all the witnesses including official and non-official witnesses have been



examined in this case. It is further reported that only second Investigating Officer is yet to be examined in this case.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence as also present stage of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of two months from the date of receipt/production, the petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

