

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38224 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-466 Year-2024 Thana- KUDRA District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Jyoti Prakash @ Jyoti Prakash Yadav S/O Jitendra Yadav R/O Village-
Bahera, P.S- Kudra, Distt.- Kaimur at Bhabua.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Tribhuwan Narayan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Syed Ehteshamuddin

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

9 10-02-2026 By an earlier order the Investigating Officer of this case had to appear in the present case and he had appeared on the date fixed which was yesterday, however, since the court was not in session, his appearance was filed before the Registrar General. Today, the necessity of the physical appearance of the Investigating Officer is not required in view of the fact that the answer to the question is found in the case diary itself.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 80(2), 3(5) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the D.P. Act.

4. Petitioner is said to have committed murder of the daughter of the informant for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry.



5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the wife of the petitioner died on 08.12.2024 whereas the present case came to be lodged 12.12.2024 after due thought and deliberation. It is further submitted that the informant and his family members as also the police were informed about the death of the deceased and it was only in their presence that the cremation was also done. It has also been submitted that the UD case was lodged which bears the signature of both the informant and his wife. As a matter of fact, the deceased had committed suicide as she was suffering from some sort of depression. The postmortem report also indicates asphyxia due to hanging with no injury on the body of the deceased. Further, the petitioner is in custody since 28.12.2024 and the trial is going on.

6. Learned APP for the State and the learned counsel for the informant both have opposed the grant of bail on the ground that he is the husband and he is primarily responsible for the welfare of his wife. Learned counsel for the informant also submits that the two private witnesses have already been examined on behalf of the prosecution and there are only two more private witnesses and the rest are official. He has seriously disputed the UD case and has pointed out material to show that their signatures were taken on the same case by alluring them to



do so.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances and also considering that fact that the petitioner happens to be the husband of the deceased and further considering that the trial is in progress, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. Accordingly, his prayer for bail is rejected in connection Kudra P.S. Case No. 466 of 2024.

8. However, the trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same preferably within a period of five months, failing which the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

devendra/-

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

