

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75565 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-334 Year-2024 Thana- KAHALGAON District- Bhagalpur

Ranvir Singh (Tanti) @ Ranvir Singh S/o- Dharmendra Singh Village-  
Makaspur Ps- Kahalgaon Dist- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bijendra Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rabindra Kumar- A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      18-01-2025                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in Kahalgaon P. S.  
Case No.334 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable  
under Sections 304(B)/ 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits  
that the petitioner is in custody since 27.05.2024, he has  
antecedent of two cases and has been falsely implicated in  
the instant case by the informant being husband of the  
deceased. It is next submitted that informant alleges that his  
daughter was married to the petitioner on 28.11.2023 and  
after about two months, the accused persons named in the  
FIR started abusing and torturing the victim. Further, on



26.05.2024 at 5.00 P.M., it is alleged that the accused persons killed the victim strangulating her. It is also alleged that accused were demanding dowry as detailed in the FIR.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case and he is in custody since 27.05.2024 and allegation of demand of dowry and torture is general and omnibus in nature. It is also submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence, as such, the entire allegation hinges around suspicion.

5. Learned A.P.P. Sri Rabindra Kumar opposes the bail application and submits that the yardstick for considering the bail of the petitioner being husband of the deceased is different from the yardstick adopted for considering the bail of other accused persons, when such occurrence are committed. It is further submitted that the deceased was married to the petitioner on 28.11.2023 and the FIR alleges that victim was killed on 26.05.2024 i.e. even within less than an year of marriage, as such, presumption in law is also against the petitioner.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties



and taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for regular bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

