

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72101 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-371 Year-2025 Thana- HARNAUT District- Nalanda

=====

Dina Saw @ Dinanath Kumar S/O Ramashray Saw Resident of village - Badi
murhari P.s.- Harnaut, Dist.- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Manoj Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Narsingh Tanti, APP
Mr. Akhileshwar Singh, Adv

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 11-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf
of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1),
238, 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that his daughter was married to Shyam Ram in the year
1999 and out of wedlock, a son namely Chintu was born, further
in the year 2012 his daughter died on account of fire in the
house, thereafter Shyam Ram performed his second marriage in
the year 2014 with Neelu, next alleges that on 11-8-2025 he



received an information that Chintu died due to hanging, accordingly he reached the place of occurrence when Shyam Ram informed that Chintu was missing since 10-8-2025, but Neelu disclosed that Chintu used to act inappropriately with her which was witnessed by Shyam Ram, accordingly a scuffle took place in which Shyam Ram strangled him and he fell and died, further with the help of petitioner and Shailendra, Shyam Ram disposed of the dead body

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that thrust of the allegations of killing Chintu is against Shyam Ram and petitioner is not alleged to have committed the occurrence of killing, rather it is alleged that he helped Shyam Ram in disposing the dead body, which is a bailable offence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, but then are not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is not alleged to have killed Chintu.



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 Harnaut P.S. Case No. 371 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

