

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40680 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-298 Year-2025 Thana- MINAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

Chhotu Ram S/o Mahendra Ram R/o Vill- Ali Neora, P.S.- Meenapur, Distt-
Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 09-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80, 85 and
3(5) of the BNS, 2023.

3. The SHO and the Investigating Officer of the case,
in compliance of the order dated 07.07.2026, are present in the
Court

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that his daughter was married to petitioner in the year
2018 and after marriage the accused persons including the
petitioner were demanding Rs. 3 Lakhs by way of dowry and on
account of non-fulfillment of the demand, the victim was



tortured, further on 15.06.2025 at 05:00 PM, the accused persons including the petitioner assaulted and made her eat ice cream laced with poison and when her condition deteriorated, the victim was admitted at SKMCH and the informant was informed, accordingly, he came to SKMCH where his daughter was being treated, further the petitioner fled and the victim disclosed about the occurrence, but died during the course of treatment on 28.06.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner, being husband, has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that petitioner was married to the deceased in the year 2018 and from 2018 till institution of the instant FIR, no case ever came to be instituted either by the informant or the deceased alleging torture on account of non-fulfillment of dowry demand. It is next submitted that it does not appear probable that had the petitioner made the victim eat ice cream laced with poison, in that event he would have brought her to a government hospital. It is further submitted that the date of occurrence is 15.06.2025 and the victim died on 28.06.2025 i.e. after being treated for more than 12-13 days. It is also submitted that since informant alleges in the FIR that victim disclosed to him that petitioner made her eat



ice cream laced with poison which amply demonstrates that the victim was conscious and in her senses, as such, if what was disclosed by the victim to the informant was a correct fact, in that event the informant could have requested the doctors and the I.O. to get the statement of the victim recorded in accordance with law. It is further submitted that the informant also in the FIR does not disclose the date on which the victim disclosed to him that she was made to eat ice cream laced with poison. It is further submitted that during the course of investigation, it transpired that petitioner was not staying in the house, as he was earning outside, as such, the victim had taken loan from different people and the loan amount had mounted and she was being pressurized by the persons who had given her loan to return back the loan amount, as such, out of frustration, the victim consumed poison.

6. On query of the Court from the SHO and the Investigating Officer of the case that as to what transpired during the course of investigation with regard to the occurrence, it is submitted that the witnesses have stated that victim had taken loan from different persons and she was not able to return the same and people who had given the loan amount were pressurizing her, as such, out of frustration, she consumed



poison. It is also submitted that during the course of investigation till date, no material transpired connecting the petitioner with the offence. It is also submitted that in the FSL report, Aluminum Phosphide was detected.

7. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

8. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Meenapur (Minapur) P.S. Case No. 298 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

9. However, it is made clear that in the event if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the



learned Trial Court bringing to its notice that petitioner despite giving assurance to this Court is not co-operating in the investigation, in that event the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

10. Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned police station through the learned Trial Court.

11 Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

12. The FSL report is being handed over back to the Investigating Officer of the case.

13. The personal appearance of the SHO and the Investigating Officer of the case is dispensed with.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

