

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9259 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-187 Year-2025 Thana- MADHUBAN District- East Champaran

Mantun Paswan @ Muntun Paswan Son of Hari Kishun Paswan R/o Village -
Manpurwa, P.S. - Madhuban, Dist. - East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunny Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Brajendra Nath Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

6 08-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Madhuban P.S. Case no. 187 of 2025 registered under sections 103(1) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that she received information about the murder of her daughter. On reaching her in-laws place and on enquiry from her grandchildren, it transpired that when they had returned home on the date of the occurrence, the petitioner, Radhika Devi, Manoj Paswan, Viresh Paswan and Amarnath Paswan were assaulting their mother. As a result of the assault and Radhika Devi having strangulated her, she died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. There is an



unexplained delay of four days in lodging of the FIR. There is allegation that there was some illicit relationship between the petitioner and the deceased. These facts do not explain the allegations of assault and murder by the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 13.9.2025 and chargesheet has been submitted in the case. He has no criminal antecedent. Lastly referring to the post-mortem report, it is submitted that the death is said to have been caused by strangulation, however no other injury has been found on the body of the deceased.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations against the petitioner in the FIR and the material that has transpired in course of investigation, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail for the present and the application is rejected.

7. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after four months or on framing of charge, whichever is later.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

saauravkrsinha/-

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

