

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86558 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-118 Year-2020 Thana- BARHARA District- Bhojpur

VIKASH KUMAR YADAV S/O BIRENDRA RAI @ VIRENDRA YADAV
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE-SHALIGRAM SINGH KE TOLA,P.S.-
BARHARA,DISTRCT-BHOJPUR

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Malti Kumari, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

4 14-02-2025

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has renewed his prayer for grant of regular bail in connection with Barhara P.S Case no.118 of 2020 registered under sections 304B, 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the daughter of the informant who was married to the petitioner herein was tortured for demand of dowry by way of motorcycle and was ultimately done to death.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the earlier application for bail of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 29.2.2024 (Annexure-1) passed in Cr. Misc. no.76700 of 2023. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case only



for the reason that he happens to be the husband of the missing daughter of the informant. In fact, it was the daughter of the informant who was suffering from mental illness who committed suicide and disappeared and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. He has remained in custody since 2.8.2023 and there is no progress whatsoever in the learned trial Court. He undertakes to cooperate in the trial and to abide by any condition which may be laid down by this Court for his release on bail.

5. The prayer for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P for the State.

6. A report was called for from the learned trial Court. As per the report received contained in letter dated 22.1.2025, cognizance was taken in the case and thereafter the case is pending at the said stage.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegation against the petitioner in the F.I.R, the petitioner being the husband of the daughter of the informant who is said to have been done to death for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry by way of motorcycle, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.



8. The petitioner is given liberty to renew his prayer
for bail on completing 2 years in custody in case there is no
progress in the learned trial Court.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Shiv/-

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

