

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1904 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-145 Year-2025 Thana- PAROO District- Muzaffarpur

Harishankar Ray S/O Jawahar Ray R/O Village- Chainpur Chiutahan, P.S-
Paroo, Distt.- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nachiketa Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Nirmala Kumari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 21-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Paroo
P.S. Case No. 145 of 2025, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 80, 238 and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that his cousin sister was married to petitioner in the
year 2020, after marriage, the petitioner along with his parents
started torturing her for dowry, further on 24.03.2025, the sister-
in-law of his sister namely Reena (Gotni) called and informed
that named accused persons including the petitioner strangled
the victim to death, accordingly, the informant came to the place
of occurrence and the dead body was recovered from palani of



of Vinod at the instance of the mother-in-law of the deceased and the dead body was sent for postmortem by the police.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner being husband has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that marriage of the petitioner with the deceased was solemnized in the year 2020 and out of the wedlock, two children were born, who presently are residing with the family of the petitioner. It is also submitted that informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence and allegation of demand of dowry and torture is also general and omnibus in nature. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the informant alleges that named accused persons committed the occurrence of killing of the deceased but then does not allege against the petitioner. It is also submitted that Vinod Ray along with five others had approached this court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No. 71852 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 16.10.2025. It is further submitted that thereafter Saraswati Devi, mother-in-law also approached the court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.65852 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 26.11.2025. Learned counsel next submits that the dead body of



the deceased was sent for postmortem. It is next submitted that had the petitioner or his family members been involved in the occurrence, in that event efforts would have been made to dispose of the dead body with a view to conceal the evidence, but then postmortem was done for ascertaining the cause of death and the postmortem report records asphyxia on account of hanging as the reason of death. It is thus submitted that victim committed suicide. It is also submitted that petitioner is in custody since 07.10.2025

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that victim died within seven years of marriage and as such in law the presumption is against the husband and his family members. It is also submitted that no doubt the family members of the petitioner have been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail but then the case of the petitioner is to be considered on a different pedestal. It is also submitted that no doubt the postmortem report records asphyxia on account of hanging as the cause of death and thus it might be a possibility that the victim committed suicide but then it is the duty of the husband to ensure well being of his wife. It is next submitted that it was husband who created condition conducive



for the victim to take the extreme step of ending her life. It is also submitted that in Cr. Misc. No. 71852/2025, except for Jawahar Ray, who was the father-in-law of the deceased, rest of the petitioners were agnates of the petitioner and were residing separately.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. The regular bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

