

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60111 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8 Year-2024 Thana- BARABAR TOURIST District- Jehanabad

Jai Ram Yadav S/O Devan Yadav Resdent of Village- Pachwai, P.S.-
Bishunganj, O.P., District-Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jogendra Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Rina Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

- 215-09-2025
1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 304(B) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his daughter was married to one Hareram Yadav in the year 2022, further after marriage, the accused persons including the petitioner were demanding a motorcycle and Rs. 50,000/-, on account of non-fulfillment of the dowry demand, his daughter was tortured, it is next alleged that on 10.02.2024 the informant contacted his son-in-law on mobile who disclosed that he is not in the house, as such, on 10.02.2024, the informant came to village Pachbai where he found the house locked and on inquiry, the people of the vicinity informed that his daughter has been killed and the accused have disappeared the dead body.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence. It is next submitted that petitioner is father-in-law of the deceased and he, for the last 15 years, was residing separately from the husband of the deceased. It is also submitted that trial commenced in respect of the mother-in-law of the deceased wherein the informant had deposed and did not support the case of the prosecution rather accepted the fact that petitioner along with his wife was residing separately. It is also submitted that Soni Devi and Gaurav Yadav had



approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No. 39758 of 2025 and the same was allowed by an order dated 27.06.2025 passed by a learned Co-ordinate Bench. It is next submitted that the case of the petitioner is also on a similar footing, as Gaurav is brother of the husband of the deceased and is son of the instant petitioner. It is also submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and taking into consideration the order dated 27.06.2025 in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 39758 of 2025, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Barabar Tourism (Bishunganj O.P.) P.S. Case No. 08 of 2024 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.



7. However, it is made clear that in the event if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned Trial Court bringing to its notice that petitioner despite giving assurance to this Court is not co-operating in the investigation, in that event the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

8. Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned police station through the learned Trial Court.

9. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

