

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29200 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-375 Year-2025 Thana- RAJAPAKAR District- Vaishali

Niraj Kumar @ Neeraj Kumar S/O Surendra Singh R/O Vill.- Pachai
Mubarak, P.S.- Rajapakar, Dist.- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Hemant Ray, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Meena Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GIRIJISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

5 21-07-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner
and learned APP appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Rajapakar P.S. Case No. 375 of 2025, registered under Sections
80, 3(5) of B.N.S. 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, which has been lodged
on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant to
the effect that in August 2023, petitioner lured the informant's
daughter, into an inter-caste marriage. It is alleged that about
five to six months after the marriage, petitioner along with his
family members began demanding dowry and on account of
non-fulfillment of demand the victim was subjected to physical
and mental cruelty, which she reported to her mother. About a
year before the incident, the deceased's mother paid



approximately ₹2,50,000 to petitioner, who used the money to open a pesticide and fertilizer shop. Despite this, the accused continued demanding money and assaulting the victim. Around fifteen days before the occurrence, the accused again brutally assaulted her, and during a phone call, petitioner and his sister-in-law called the victim's mother and threatened that Kajal would be killed if their demand for money was not fulfilled. On 19.10.2025, after receiving information about victim's death, the informant reached her matrimonial home and found her dead lying on a bed inside a room locked from the outside, while all the accused found absconded. The informant alleges that the accused, acting in furtherance of their common intention, murdered her daughter and suspects the involvement of other persons as well.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The prosecution case is completely false and fabricated one. The petitioner is the husband of the deceased. He further states that the petitioner never harassed the informant's daughter for dowry nor made any dowry demand in any manner. The petitioner has been in judicial custody since 15.12.2025. Therefore, the petitioner deserves the privilege of regular bail.



5. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased who, along with other accused persons, conspired the murder of the informant's daughter for dowry and therefore he does not deserve to be granted bail.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and after going through the records, it appears that the petitioner being the husband of the deceased, has been in judicial custody since 15.12.2025. The petitioner is named accused in the FIR who, along with other accused persons, participated in the murder of the informant's daughter for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, which is supported by paragraphs 07, 08, and 09 of the case diary. Paragraph 02 of the case diary contains the Inquest Report of deceased, which mentions the cause of death as injury marks on her neck. Paragraph 21 of the case diary contains the Post-Mortem Report of deceased, in which the doctor has opined that the cause of death is of asphyxia due to hanging. Further perusal of the records reveals that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased. The primary place of incident is the petitioner's house, and the incident occurred within seven years of marriage. Paragraph 11 of the case diary shows that the place



of incident is the deceased's matrimonial home.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that the deceased has been done to death on account of non-fulfillment of demand of dowry as well as the fact that the petitioner happens to be the husband of the deceased, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the same is hereby, rejected.

(Girijish Kumar, J)

amit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

