

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30281 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2022 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Sudhir Mandal, S/o Harendra Mandal, R/o Village-Tilak Tajpur, P.S-
Runnisaidpur, Dist - Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Patna
2. Malti Devi, W/o Lalan Mandal, R/o Village -Gangwara, P.S- Runnisaidpur,
Dist - Sitamarhi

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Hans Lal Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bishweshwar Ram, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

4 24-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The accused/petitioner is named in the FIR and

apprehending his arrest in connection with Runnisaidpur P.S.

Case No.47 of 2022 (S. Tr. No.174 of 2023) registered

under Sections 304-B read with 34 of the Indian Penal

Code.

3. As per FIR, the petitioner along with co-accused

persons/family members caused death of daughter of

informant due to non-fulfilment of demand of dowry.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing for



petitioner that the trial of in-laws members was separated with this petitioner where the informant (PW-3) in (S. Tr. No.174 of 2023) categorically deposed that her daughter having suicidal tendency since her childhood and, therefore, out of said tendency, she committed suicide, having no fault of in-laws' family members including this petitioner.

5. It is submitted that in view of such deposition and as on all material aspects, the investigation of this case is completed, therefore, sending this petitioner behind the bar would not serve any purpose of justice. The petitioner is a man of clean antecedent.

6. Learned APP while opposing the prayer of bail submitted that the deposition of informant and other prosecution witnesses in separate trial cannot be read while deciding the present prayer of anticipatory bail filed by the husband. It is submitted that as per FIR, the informant categorically stated that it was her deceased daughter, who said her during treatment that this petitioner, who is the husband and also all in-laws family members assaulted her badly and strangulated her, due to which, she became



unconscious and, thereafter, she was brought to hospital for treatment, where she died finally.

7. In view of aforesaid factual submissions and by taking note of fact, as the allegation of physical assault and strangulation appears available against this petitioner, who is the husband in terms of FIR, accordingly, the prayer of anticipatory bail of petitioner stands rejected.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J.)

Sanjeet/-

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

