

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38678 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-148 Year-2025 Thana- SANJHOLI District- Rohtas

Gulshan Kumar @ Gulshan Govind Kumar S/o Jai Mangal Yadav R/o village-
Khutaha (Bensagar), P.S. - Sanjhauli, District - Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Nagendra Upadhyay, Advocate Mr. Mayashankar Mishra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Ms. Nirmala Kumari, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Dhaneshwar Prasad Gupta, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GIRIJISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 24-07-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

petitioner and learned APP for the State as well as learned

counsel appearing for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with

Sanjhauli P.S. Case No. 148/2025 registered for offences

punishable under section 80(2), 3(5) of B.N.S, 2023 and under

section 3 and 4 of the D.P. Act.

3. As per prosecution case, the daughter of the

informant is alleged to have been killed by the petitioner and his

family members on account of non-fulfillment of demand of

dowry.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent, committed no



offence, and has been falsely implicated in the instant case merely on the ground that he happens to be her husband. He further submits that, in fact, the deceased committed suicide by hanging herself on account of petty dispute with her husband. He further submits that prior to lodging of this FIR, no complain of demand of dowry or torture has ever been made by the deceased against the petitioner. He next submits that the deceased died due to asphyxia caused by hanging and it shows that the deceased committed suicide. He further submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 01.08.2025. Hence, the petitioner may be granted the regular bail.

5. Learned APP appearing for the State as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submit that there is specific allegation against the petitioner that he has made dowry demand and on account of the same, the deceased died. It has been submitted that the informant and other witnesses have supported the prosecution version and as is evident from paragraphs 19, 38, 48 and 49 of the case diary. Moreover, the postmortem report reveals that the deceased died due to asphyxia caused by hanging, therefore, the petitioner



does not deserve bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that the petitioner happens to be the husband of the deceased, who is said to have been killed for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, coupled with the fact that the doctor has opined that the deceased died due to asphyxia caused by hanging, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has played a pivotal role in the offence of death of the deceased and even if it is assumed that the deceased has committed suicide, the complicity and role of the petitioner could not be ruled out in the entire episode of occurrence, therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant the bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail is, hereby, rejected and the bail application is dismissed.

8. However, the learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously.

(Girijish Kumar, J)

dhameshwar/-

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

