

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26966 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-413 Year-2020 Thana- CHAPRA MUFFASIL District- Saran

Santosh Kumar Mahto S/o Ramesh Mahto R/o vill - Dumariya, P.S.- Chhapra,
Distt.- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL ORDER

2 22-04-2026 None appears on behalf of the petitioner. However,
learned A.P.P for the State is present.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection with Saran Muffasil P.S. Case No. 413 of 2020 lodged on 12.09.2020, for the offence punishable under Sections 304(B) & 201 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chapra at Saran.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged by virtue of complaint in which, five persons were named accused including the present petitioner with allegation that they have killed the informant's daughter due to non-fulfillment of



demand of dowry.

4. As per the present bail application, it has been stated that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case due to non-fulfillment of the grievance of the informant. It has been stated that the victim died due to Corona and her dead body was also disposed off in presence of the informant. It has also been stated in para 3 of the present bail application that the petitioner has clean antecedent.

5. It transpires to this Court that the counsel for the petitioner has annexed anticipatory bail applications of other co-accused persons, granted by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court *vide* orders dated 20.05.2025 & 03.12.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 33169 of 2025 & Cr. Misc. No. 77552 of 2025 respectively (Annexure-2 series).

6. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that those accused persons who were granted anticipatory bail are the family members and not the husband of the deceased. Here in the present case, the petitioner is the husband of the deceased.

7. As such, in the present facts and circumstances of the case considering that allegation of demand of dowry and threat is there and the petitioner is the husband of the deceased,



this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.
Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner
stands rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

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

