

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37881 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-650 Year-2025 Thana- ARA NAGAR District- Bhojpur

Uma Shankar Prasad S/o Harihar Sah @ Harihar Prasad Resident of Village-  
Hanuman Tola, Dharahara, P.S.- Ara Town, Dist.- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Madan Mohan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Madhura Nand Jha

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      23-06-2026              1.    Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2.    The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection  
with Ara Town PS Case No. 650 of 2025 registered for the  
offences punishable under Sections 80 and 61(2) of the  
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3.    Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant  
alleges that Abhishek on 9-4-2025 married her daughter after  
enticing her, next alleges that whenever informant went to meet  
her daughter, Abhishek, petitioner, Amit and mother along with  
sister of Abhishek used to humiliate her and demanded dowry of  
Rs. 12 lakh and jewellery and on account of non-fulfillment of  
the demand, used to torture her and the victim used to disclose



on phone, next alleges that on account of non-fulfillment of dowry demand, the victim was killed and on 22-10-2025 and her dead body was cremated.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case being father-in-law of the deceased. It is next submitted that informant is not an eye-witness to the occurrence and allegation of demand of dowry and torture is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that petitioner along with his wife had separated from the husband of the deceased and as such was not in touch with the deceased and his son. It is also submitted that marriage of the deceased with his son was a love marriage.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that the victim died within seven years of marriage as such presumption in law is also against the husband and his family members. It is next submitted that if what has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is a correct fact in that event the dead body would not have been cremated rather the same would have been sent for postmortem for ascertaining the cause of death. It is further submitted that allegation is of



cremating the dead body without postmortem being done which amply demonstrates the conduct of the husband of the deceased and his family members. It is also submitted that it is not disputed by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that the dead body was cremated but then it is not possible for the husband to cremate the dead body all alone which further raises a doubt against the conduct of the petitioner who is father-in-law of the deceased.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

Sumit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

