

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3380 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-161 Year-2025 Thana- BIBHUTIPUR District- Samastipur

Md. Irshad @ Md. Irsad S/o Md. Ahmad Resident of Village- Patailiya, Ward
No. 06, P.S.- Bibhutipur, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vijay Anand
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nityanand, APP
Ms. Saroj Kumar Chaudhary.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 3 15-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 123 and 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody since 13-10-2025 and the informant alleges that petitioner was exploiting her daughter for the last two years on pretext of false promise of marriage, further earlier petitioner had eloped with her daughter but later resiled from marriage, next alleges that petitioner had given a bottle of poison to Md Hussain, who gave



it to the victim and the victim consumed poison and thus was taken to hospital but died during the course of treatment on 27-5-2025.

4. 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 petitioner and the victim were in love. It is further submitted that the informant herself alleges that earlier petitioner and the victim had eloped. It is also submitted that since parents of the petitioner were not ready for marriage, as such the petitioner informed about the same to the victim when she consumed poison, but then the informant alleges that poison was provided by the petitioner to Md. Hussain, who delivered it to the victim, who consumed and died during the course of treatment. It is next submitted that it does not appear probable that petitioner would have given poison to Md. Hussain, who in turn, would have given it to the victim and the victim would have consumed it. It is also submitted that even from the side of the victim objections about the relationship were brewing. It is next submitted that if privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner will not abscond rather will co-operate



in the trial to prove his innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, let the petitioner above named be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-five 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 Bibhutipur P.S. Case No. 161 of 2025.

7. However, it is made clear that if the learned trial court comes to a conclusion that the petitioner after his release is trying to delay the framing of charge or after framing of charge is delaying the trial in any manner, the learned trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

