

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68866 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-43 Year-2025 Thana- ITARHI District- Buxar

=====

Luttu Yadav S/o Late Kunja Bihari Yadav R/o Village - Indore, P.S. - Itarhi,
District - Buxar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bharat Bhushan, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND
MALVIYA**

ORAL ORDER

4 17-12-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is in custody in connection with
Itarhi P.S Case No. 43 of 2025 S.Tr. No. 185 of 2025 registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 80(2), 61, 238 of the
BNS.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, sister of the informant
is married to Luttu Yadav (Petitioner) on 18.12.2018 with the
Hindu rituals. After two years of marriage, his sister was
tortured and then hanged her to death.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He next
submits that petitioner is the husband of the deceased and he as



no role in the incident. The occurrence held at a time when he was not present at his house as he had gone for his livelihood in the field as Labour. He further submits that the present FIR has been filed with a delay of seven days. The incident occurred on 01.03.2025 but the present FIR has been lodged on 08.03.2025. It is also submitted that petitioner is in judicial custody since 11.03.2025 having clean antecedent.

5. However, learned APP for the State oppose the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner.

6. On perusal of the FIR case diary and the impugned order dated 19.07.2025, it appears that petitioner is the husband of the deceased and petitioner along with the family members used to torture the deceased and have killed. Moreover, petitioner's along with the family members had done the last rituals of the deceased without informing family members of the deceased which make a serious doubt about the unnatural death of the deceased. So, considering the aforesaid fact and circumstances of this case, and the serious nature of allegation levelled against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the regular bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected. However, petitioner is at liberty to



renew his prayer for bail before the trial Court after one year from the production/receipt of the copy of this order before the learned Trial Court.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

