

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17844 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-249 Year-2013 Thana- KALYANPUR District- Samastipur

Jitendra Lal Karn @ Jitendra Kumar Karn, Male-age about 48 years, Son of Late Birju Lal Karn, Resident of village - Kolhuara, P.S.- Kalyanpur, District- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shubhesh Pandey, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND MALVIYA
ORAL ORDER

4 24-06-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sessions Trial No. 09 of 2025 arising out of Kalyanpur P.S. Case No. 249 of 2013 instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 304(B), 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Allegation against the petitioner and his family members is to have administered poison to the daughter of the informant, as a result of which she died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence and has falsely been implicated in this case. He submits that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased. He further submits



that the present case is of the year 2013 and the informant side during course of investigation itself has filed a compromise petition. He next submits that the other co-accused persons have been acquitted by the learned trial Court as stated in para-8 of the petition. Petitioner has got clean antecedent as stated in para 3 of the petition is in custody since 25.11.2024.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner.

6. From perusal of the FIR, status report and also perused the impugned order dated 09.01.2026 passed by the learned District and Additional Sessions Judge-IX, Samastipur, it appears that petitioner is named in the FIR. From perusal of the records, it also appears that the marriage of the deceased was solemnized with the petitioner on 01.05.2013 and soon thereafter the petitioner (accused) started demanding Rs. 50,000/- from the deceased for construction of his house. On 24.06.2013, the informant received the information that his daughter was killed by the accused persons in Delhi by administering her poison. It also appears that in this case charges have been framed against the accused persons including the petitioner and the trial has commenced and only two prosecution witnesses have been examined and other



prosecution witnesses including the informant and official witnesses are yet to be examined. From perusal of the status report vide letter no. 106 of 2026 dated 20.05.2026, it also appears that charges has been framed against accused persons on 20.02.2025 and eleven prosecution witnesses are named in the chargesheet. Out of eleven prosecution witnesses two prosecution witnesses have been examined and cross-examined and process for appearance of the witnesses have already been issued against the non-official prosecution witnesses and the next date fixed for evidence is 20.05.2026 as well as the fact that the trial is under progress, so considering the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to the above named petitioner.

7. Prayer for regular bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. Learned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as early as possible.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Anand Kr.

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

