

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22304 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-105 Year-2023 Thana- TRIVENIGANJ District- Supaul

SUBIN KUMAR S/o Parshuram Chauhan R/o vill - Latuna, ward no. 3, P.S.-
Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gopal Kumar Jha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

6 24-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of
the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Triveniganj P.S. Case No.105/2023, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 341, 323, 498(A), 307 and 34 of the
Indian Penal Code and Section 4 of the D.P. Act. Later on Sections
304(B) and 302 of the Indian Penal Code were added.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is husband and has been falsely implicated in the instant
case by the informant, alleging that her daughter who was married
to the petitioner was killed by the accused persons including the
petitioner on account of non-fulfillment of dowry demand.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence and the entire
allegation hinges around suspicion. It is further submitted that the



Court made a specific query from the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that as to when the marriage in between the deceased and petitioner was performed, on which, it is submitted that he does not have any instruction on the issue nor the FIR discloses the date of marriage. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that marriage in between the petitioner and the deceased was performed in the year 2022 and the occurrence took place in the year 2023 i.e. within an year of marriage. It is also submitted that though informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence but then presumption in law is against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the postmortem report also records asphyxia on account of strangulation. It is next submitted that trial has commenced and three witnesses have been examined, as such the trial is going on.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

6. The regular bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

