

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67391 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-160 Year-2025 Thana- PAKRIDAYAL District- East Champaran

Mithilesh Kumar Sahani @ Mithlesh Kumar S/O Vinod Sahani R/o Village-
Bhagwanpur, P.S.- Pakaridayal, Dist.- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjana Srivastava, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.
Chandra Bhushan Prasad, learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 238, 80(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he came to know on 22.04.2025 that his daughter has been killed by the accused persons including the petitioner for non-fulfillment of the dowry demand of a motorcycle. Accordingly, the informant reached the place of occurrence but the accused had fled away and the dead body was concealed. Further, from the wedlock, two children were born who are aged about two years and one year.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case being the husband. It is further submitted that informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence. It is next submitted that from perusal of the FIR, it would manifest that the informant does not specifically record as to what was being demanded in dowry. It is also submitted that whenever any dispute arises in between the husband and the wife and the occurrence of the nature as alleged takes place, the entire family members are implicated.

5. Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased and if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that even the dead body of the deceased was not found which amply demonstrates that after killing the victim, the accused persons including the petitioner either disposed of the dead body or cremated the same and the investigation is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with



Pakaridayal P.S. Case No. 160 of 2025 pending in the Court of
learned 8th Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, East
Champaran at Motihari/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

