

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9044 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-56 Year-2024 Thana- SITAMARHI District- Nawada

Badal Chauhan @ Badal Kumar Son of Sri Mithilesh Chauhan Resident of
village Milki Beldari, P.S.- Sitamarhi, District - Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Thakur, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Syed Ehteshamuddin, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 24-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner Sri Ajay Thakur, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sitamarhi P.S. Case No.56/2024 dated 23.06.2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 304(B) and 201 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his daughter was married to the petitioner in the year 2023, out of the wedlock, a child was born, next alleges that he had a talk in the night with his samdhi and samdhan, who asked him to bring Panchayat or else they will ask his daughter to leave or kill her, when he called his samdhi in the



morning, his mobile was switched off, accordingly he along with his family members reached the matrimonial house of his daughter but the house of locked and no one was present, thus alleges that accused persons killed his daughter and disposed the dead body, further petitioner used to assault the victim for non-fulfillment of dowry demand of Rs.5 lacs, TV and Fridge.

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 from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant himself alleges that he had a talk with the parents of the petitioner, who were asking him to bring Panchayat or else the victim would be killed. It is further submitted that petitioner works as a labourer at Sahebganj and the police has also investigated the CDR of the mobile number of the petitioner and found the tower location on 22.06.2024 of the said mobile at Mirza chak, P.S. Shanti Nagar, District-Sahebganj. It is thus submitted that the petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence. It is fairly submitted that the dead body of the victim was recovered from Falgu river near a Shiv temple at Khijarsarai.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel



appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that the daughter of the informant died and her dead body was recovered from Falgu river at Khijarsarai. It is further submitted that the marriage was only two years old as such in law also the presumption is against the husband and his family members. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant specifically alleges that petitioner used to assault the victim for non-fulfillment of dowry demand. It is further submitted that it does not appear probable that the dead body would have travelled 40-42 km from the place of occurrence to be recovered from Falgu river. It is next submitted that statement of the mother-in-law of the deceased was recorded by the police, wherein she has stated that motorcycle was being demanded under the threat that if motorcycle is not given, in that event, the petitioner may commit something and she also disclosed that the victim consumed poison in anger. It is next submitted that even presuming that the victim committed suicide by consuming poison, it was husband who created condition conducive for the victim to take extreme step of



ending her life. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is still continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

