

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8508 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-59 Year-2025 Thana- MUSRIGHRARI District- Samastipur

Sonu Kumar S/O Surendra Prasad Singh R/O Village- Fatehpur Wala Ward
No. 6, P.S- Mushrigharari, Distt.- Samastipur. (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bindeswari Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dilip Kumar No. 1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 23-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S. and Sections 3 and 4 of the D.P. Act.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 10.07.2025 and is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that her daughter was married to petitioner on 19.05.2024. Further, after 10 months of marriage the accused persons including the petitioner started demanding dowry of Rs.5 Lacs and on account of non-fulfilment of the demand the victim was tortured. On 10.05.2025, informant received an information that accused persons have killed her daughter. Accordingly, she went to the



place of occurrence and saw the dead body of her daughter lying, thus alleges that accused persons killed her daughter and thereafter hanged her dead body.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant being husband of the deceased. It is next submitted that no doubt victim died within seven years of marriage but then all deaths are not dowry death. It is also submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence and the entire allegations hinges around suspicion and even allegation of demand of dowry and torture is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that charges have been framed and trial has commenced and the informant along with brother of the deceased have become hostile in the trial and a compromise has been entered in between the parties as such no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in jail. It is also submitted that petitioner at the time of occurrence was not present at the place of occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the bail application and submits that what is not dispute rather stands admitted is that victim died within seven years of marriage and the presumption in law is against the husband and his family



members. It is also submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that how the informant who instituted the FIR became hostile in the trial along with her son when the post mortem report clearly records that the cause of death as cardio respiratory failure due to strangulation which amply demonstrates that the victim was strangled to death.

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

7. The prayer of the petitioner for regular bail stands rejected.

8. Let a copy of this order be sent to the learned Trial Court.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

