

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12095 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-15 Year-2025 Thana- BALIYA District- Begusarai

Sushil Kumar S/o Rameshwar Yadav @ Jiro Yadav Resident of Village-
Jagdishpur, P.S.- Balia, Distt- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kumar Binode Bariar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bishweshwar Ram, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-05-2026 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 137(2) and 140(1) of the
BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody
since 25.04.2025 and the informant alleges that his daughter
was married to the petitioner about five years back. Further, the
petitioner, for the last six months, was demanding a motorcycle
and Rs.2 lakhs but the informant was not able to fulfill the
demand, hence, the victim was tortured. Further, there was
absolutely no communication in between the informant and the
victim since 11.01.2025. Further, on 12.01.2025, the informant
went to meet the victim but she was not present in the house



and, on inquiry, the petitioner disclosed that she has been killed, thus, alleges that petitioner along with accused persons killed the victim.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that even if the petitioner had killed the victim whether he would have disclosed the said fact to the informant who is his father-in-law. It is next submitted that allegation of demand of dowry and torture is general and omnibus in nature. It is also submitted that the victim went missing for which a Sanha was instituted.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner is the husband of the victim and the dead body of the victim till date has not been recovered. It is further submitted that if the victim was missing then why the petitioner did not institute an FIR. It is next submitted that the victim went missing within seven years of marriage and, as such, presumption in law is also against the husband and his family members. It is also submitted that petitioner even confessed his guilt during the course of investigation that he had killed the victim as has come in para 68 of the case diary.



6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail in connection with S. Tr. No. 1192 of 2025 arising out of Balia P.S. Case No. 15 of 2025 pending in the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-VIII, Begusarai/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

