

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44400 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-61 Year-2024 Thana- DHANGAI District- Gaya

Guddu Kumar Yadav son of Rampati Yadav village- Revda, tola Nayka, Ps-
dhangai, Dist- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binod Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Naresh Ray, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Vijay Kumar, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

3 01-09-2025 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 Dhangai P.S. Case No.
61 of 2024, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections
304B/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, daughter of
the informant was done to death for non-fulfillment 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 the husband of the deceased. The petitioner neither



tortured his wife for demand of dowry, nor he killed his wife. It is next submitted that son of the informant told him that the petitioner has killed his sister by tying *dupatta* on her neck. It is submitted that when the petitioner went outside of the village, his wife has committed suicide by hanging on the alleged date of occurrence. The petitioner is in custody since 28.06.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that other co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 13.11.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 79726 of 2024.

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. It is further submitted that witnesses in paragraph nos. 6, 7 and 8 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

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



7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six 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	
---	--	---	--

