

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7320 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2025 Thana- EKANGARSARAI District- Nalanda

Bipin Kumar S/o Sikandar Prasad Resident of Village- Upari Manpur
Dhangawan, P.O.- Dhkangawan, P.S.- Ekangarsarai, Distt.- Nalanda (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ran Vijay Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 08-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 80(2) of the Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that his maternal-niece was married to petitioner about
four years back, on 10-3-2025 the informant received an
information that his niece was brutally murdered, accordingly
the informant reached the place of occurrence and saw that dead
body was kept on an *auto* with an intention to dispose of the
same, but the *auto* was stopped by Gaurav and his friends; and
all the accused fled, further the dead body was sent for post-



mortem. It is next alleged that accused persons used to torture the victim alleging that she cannot give birth to a child.

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 the informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence. It is also submitted that the marriage was four years old; and in between these four years, no case ever came to be instituted either by the deceased or the informant alleging torture. It is next submitted that the victim was being treated by doctors for curing her infertility, but the same was not cured on account of which the victim started remaining depressed. It is further submitted that since the victim was not able to bear a child, as such she committed suicide, as has been pleaded at Para-12 of the bail application. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the informant does not allege demand of dowry nor the informant discloses who informed him about the death of the victim. It is further submitted that after the victim committed suicide, an *auto* was called for taking the body to a hospital for post-mortem, but by then the informant along with others came and the instant FIR came to be instituted with an allegation that the petitioner and his family members



were trying to dispose of the dead body. It is also submitted that victim was being treated for her infertility as would manifest from Annexures-2 and 3 to the bail application. It is also submitted that there are other prescriptions relating to the treatment. It is next submitted that no doubt the informant died within seven years of marriage, but then all deaths are not dowry death and it is not that in all cases husband and his family members are involved in killing the deceased. It is further submitted that the marriage is four years old and in these four years the deceased could not conceive. It is reiterated and submitted that had petitioner or his family members been torturing the deceased for not conceiving a child in that event some dispute might have arisen, but then no case or complaint ever came to be instituted. It is next submitted that petitioner is in custody since since 24-6-2025. It is also submitted that if privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the trial to prove his innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above named be



released on bail on furnishing bail bond 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 Ekangarsarai P.S. Case No. 55 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, in both the conditions the learned trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

