

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69531 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2025 Thana- TETERHAT District- Lakhisarai

Dharmendra Yadav Son of Late Haricharan Yadav Resident of Village -
Jhinaura, P.S. - Tetarhat, District - Lakhisarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Umesh Prasad

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Umeshanand Pandit

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 10-10-2025 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 80, 238, 3(5) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

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 Rahul in the year 2024 and at the
time of marriage, the informant by way of gift had given 6 lakh
rupees along with a motorcycle and had spent an amount of 5 lakh
rupees on food and other articles. It is next alleged that after
marriage, the named accused persons were demanding dowry and on
non-fulfillment of the demand, the victim was tortured. It is further
alleged that on 2-2-2025, he received an information that his
daughter is ill, accordingly he reached the place of occurrence, but



found the house locked and came to know that the accused had fled and the dead body of the deceased was disposed of.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. It is further submitted that the petitioner is not related with the husband of the deceased in any manner rather is a co-villager. It is next submitted that the name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of Ramashish Yadav (father-in-law of the deceased) wherein he disclosed that the petitioner also participated in the cremation. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the petitioner is a co-villager, as such he was not even aware about the occurrence and on request of Ramashish and his family members, he along with other villagers participated in the occurrence. It is thus submitted that even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting, then the petitioner is not alleged to have participated in the occurrence of killing the deceased. It is next submitted that Ramashish Yadav has been granted the privilege of regular bail by a learned Co-ordinate Bench by an order dated 3-9-2025 in Cr. Misc No. 43796 of 2025. It is further submitted that the petitioner will not have 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, 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 Tetarhat Police Station Case No. 19 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the 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 the petitioner, despite giving assurance to this Court, is not cooperating 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.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

