

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68096 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-107 Year-2024 Thana- SONO District- Jamui

Bhagat Sah, S/O Sidheswar Sah, Resident of Village- Sarewad, P.S- Sono,  
District- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhishek Anand, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bharat Lal, Adv.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      07-11-2025                      Heard learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the  
  
petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the  
  
State.

2. This is the second attempt made on behalf of the  
petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Sono P.S. Case  
No. 107 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under  
Sections 498A and 304(B) of the Indian Penal Code and Section  
¾ of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Earlier the prayer for bail of the petitioner was  
rejected by this Court vide order dated 20.01.2025 in Criminal  
Miscellaneous No. 73637 of 2024, after taking into  
consideration the post mortem report, which clearly shown that  
the victim was subjected to assault prior to her death, coupled  
with the fact that during the course of investigation, the



independent witnesses have supported the prosecution case. Moreover, the alleged death had taken place just within three years of marriage preceding to demand of dowry and torture. On the last occasion, when the matter was heard, the report was called for vide order dated 26.09.2025. In pursuant thereto, this Court is apprised that till date, only one prosecution witness has been examined and yet five witnesses are to be examined.

4. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and the learned Advocate for the informant vehemently opposed the bail application and submits that the materials available on record besides the specific accusation against the petitioner, who is none else, but the husband of the deceased, it does not require any reconsideration.

5. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the materials available on record as also the order dated 20.01.2025, whereby the prayer for bail of the petitioner has been rejected, this Court does not accede to the prayer for regular bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

6. It is expected that the learned trial Court shall take all sincere endeavor to expedite the trail and conclude the same



as earliest. In case the trial of the petitioner does not conclude within a period of nine months, he would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail before this Court.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

