

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24342 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-193 Year-2018 Thana- LALGANJ District- Vaishali

Ranjit Paswan @ Ranjeet Paswan Son of Virendra Paswan @ Devendra
Paswan Resident of Village- Chhitrauli, P.S.- Lalganj, Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Aniket Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Priya Sharan Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 24-07-2026 Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Lalganj P.S. Case No. 193 of 2018, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304(B), 120(B) & 201 of the IPC.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is of causing death of the informant's daughter on account of non-fulfillment of demand of dowry in connivance with other co-accused persons.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner happens to be brother-in-law of the deceased and separate in mess and business. The alleged occurrence took place on 18.12.2017 whereas the complaint case was instituted



on 05.03.2018, which was later on sent to the concerned police station and accordingly the present FIR was instituted. The entire allegation revolves around the husband of the deceased, who had voluntarily surrendered before the learned Court below on 01.12.2025 and still under incarceration. The other accused persons have been allowed the privilege of regular bail on 26.02.2026 in Cr. Misc. No. 6270 of 2026.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State vehemently opposed the bail application and submits that the petitioner has been evading his arrest for the last eight years irrespective of the fact, he is named accused in the FIR. It is further contended that now the process under Section 82 has already been issued and on this score also, the present anticipatory bail sans any merit.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Advocates for the respective parties and taking note of the fact that there is no special or extraordinary circumstances to entertain the application for pre-arrest bail after the process under Section 82 having been issued besides the petitioner has been evading his arrest for the last eight years and the others have been allowed regular bail. This Court is not acceded to the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.



7. Accordingly the present application for pre-arrest bail stands rejected.

8. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the jurisdictional Court within a period of four weeks from today, his prayer for bail shall be considered without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Harish Kumar, J)

sumit/-

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

