

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69282 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-139 Year-2024 Thana- MAHUA District- Vaishali

Santosh Paswan, S/o- Ram Lal Paswan, Village- Mukundpur Singhara, P.S.-
Mahua Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Priyesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Uday Pratap Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Bijay Kumar Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Dilip Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 20-01-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel
for the informant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with
Mahua P.S. Case No. 139 of 2024 instituted for the offence under
Sections 302 and 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the daughter of the
informant, namely, Gunja Kumari was married to Santosh Paswan
(Petitioner) in the year 2015. After some days of marriage, the
husband and father-in-law demanded motorcycle and Rs. 1 Lakh
cash and for that she was being subjected to cruelty. On
19.032024, her in-laws namely, sasur Ram Lal, mother-in-law
Sohagba Devi and others killed and concealed the dead body.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner
that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has



been falsely implicated in the present case. It has further been submitted that the basis of the case is that the deceased was subjected to cruelty on account of non-fulfillment of dowry demand but the petitioner is having three issues with the deceased and prior to this occurrence, there has been no complain regarding dowry demand. A statement has been made in para-3 of the petition that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. Moreover, he is languishing in judicial custody since 11.07.2024.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state and learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that from perusal of the case diary, it transpires in para nos. 3 and 4 the witnesses have stated that this petitioner was also instrumental in the alleged occurrence. In supervision note, it has been noted that on 16.03.2024, the petitioner called the deceased and on 17.03.2024, deceased came with her two children to her matrimonial house where she was being killed. The police has found the role of this petitioner in hatching the conspiracy. Petitioner is the husband of the deceased. It is also alleged that the dead body was concealed.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.



7. Petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for
bail after six months, if so advised.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

lata/-

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

