

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74901 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-303 Year-2023 Thana- MANJHAGARH District- Gopalganj

Pradeep Mahto @ Pradip Kumar Son of Nannu Mahto Resident of Village -  
Fulwaria , Dhanuk Toli , P.S. - Manjhagarh, District - Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramadhar Shekhar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Suman Kumari Singh, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH  
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

4      24-01-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned  
APP for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with  
S.T. No. 94 of 2024 arising out of Manjhagarh P.S. Case No.  
303 of 2023, registered under Sections 304(B)/34 of the Indian  
Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, the accused  
persons including the present petitioner committed murder of  
daughter of the informant for non-fulfillment of demand of  
dowry.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the  
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the  
present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that



the petitioner is brother-in-law of the deceased and he is separate in mess and business from the deceased and her husband. No specific allegation has been attributed against the petitioner. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that similarly situated co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 09.04.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 5515 of 2024.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submitted that as per paragraph nos. 4, 5 and 6 of the case diary, it appears that there is specific allegation against the petitioner of strangulating the neck of the deceased and committing her murder. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected.

**(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)**

Rajorshi/-

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

