

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28066 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-198 Year-2023 Thana- HARLAKHI District- Madhubani

=====

Sogarath Sah S/O Ramashish Sah Resident of Village- Raima, P.S.-
Saharghat, Dist.- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bhavesk Kumar Sah

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shyam Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA

ORAL ORDER

3 10-06-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302, 201 of the I.P.C. and 27 Arms Act.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with other co-accused persons, hired some criminals in order to get her daughter-in-law killed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner happens to be the father-in-law of the deceased and it would be evident from the First Information Report itself that dead body of an unknown woman was recovered by the police at Indo-Nepal border who was thrown after killing by gunshot. Admittedly, there is no eyewitness to the occurrence and the entire case rests on suspicion and the confessional statements. It is further submitted that there was some matrimonial discord between the deceased and her husband while the petitioner was



living separately from them and was working outside for earning his living.

5. It is gathered from the records that one Vimlesh Kumar had confessed his guilt during the course of investigation indicating the manner of the offence and also that he had been hired for killing the deceased by the accused persons and it was also disclosed in the confession that the husband of the deceased along with his brother were also present during the occurrence. However, save and except such confession in police custody which has no evidentiary value, there is no other material appearing against the petitioner to show his complicity. Since the occurrence has not taken place within the confines of the house of the petitioner, there is no reverse burden of proof on this petitioner. It is further submitted that all the other family members including the husband of the deceased has been granted bail by coordinating Benches of this Court vide orders 25.10.2024, 19.08.2025, 09.10.2025 and 26.09.2025 passed in Cr. Misc No. 58768 of 2024, Cr. Misc no. 3612 of 2025, Cr. Misc no 58286 of 2025 and Cr. Misc no.54235 of 2025 respectively. The petitioner is in custody since 14.12.2025 and charge-sheet has already been submitted.

6. Learned APP for the State has opposed the application for bail on the ground that the petitioner has absconded for quite sometime on account of which the trial as against him has



not commenced.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances and also considering the fact that the petitioner happens to be the father-in-law of the deceased and there is no specific allegation as against him coupled with the fact that other co-accused persons including the husband of the deceased have already been admitted to bail, let the above named petitioner, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Harlakhi P.S. Case No. 198/2023.

8. However, it is directed that the petitioner shall appear on each and every date fixed in the trial and in the case of non-appearance on single date without sufficient cause, would entail cancellation of his bail bonds by the learned Trial Court.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

devendra/-

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

