

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47516 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-104 Year-2025 Thana- BODHGAYA District- Gaya

Binod Yadav Son of Late Ramdhani yadav village- Nawadih, Ps- Dobhi, Dist-
Gaya Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Adv. Mr. Praveen Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha, APP
For the informant :	Mr. Dharendra Kumar Sinha, Adv. Soni Kumari, Adv. Amrit Lal, Adv. Vaishnavi Kashyap, Adv.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

4 07-01-2026 Heard learned Sr. counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State as also learned counsel for the

informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bodh
Gaya P.S. Case No. 104 of 2025 registered for the offence
punishable under Section-140(3) of B.N.S.

3. According to allegation, the deceased was done to
death by her family members. Her marriage was solemnized
with Vikash Kumar, son of the petitioner.

4. Learned Sr. counsel for the petitioner has submitted
that the petitioner is father-in-law of the deceased having no
concern with day-to-day affairs of the couple. Except the



confessional statement of the petitioner, there is nothing against him in the entire case diary. Learned Sr. counsel has also submitted that even if, his confessional statement, the petitioner though implicated his own family members but his complicity does not transpire from perusal of his confessional statement.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the informant have submitted that from perusal of confessional statement of the petitioner, it transpires that he was privi to the commission of the occurrence. Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that the trial is on the verge of its conclusion. Except the investigating officer, all the prosecution witnesses have been examined. Learned counsel has also submitted that for recording his deposition, the investigating officer appeared in the court but on that day, the court was not available, so, he returned without get recorded his deposition. It has also been submitted that the informant has been examined as P.W.-6. During his examination-in-chief, he has stated that he received telephonic threatening from the petitioner, which was recorded in his mobile and the audio clip was accepted in the court.

6. It transpires that the trial is on the verge of its conclusion.



7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, specially the fact that the trial is on the verge of its conclusion, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is *rejected*.

8. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Gaya is directed to take every efforts for production of the I.O. in the court for his deposition.

9. The learned court below is directed to record the deposition of the investigating officer on the date of his appearance itself.

10. It is expected that the trial shall be concluded within a period of two months. If the trial is not concluded within a period of two months, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

11. It is made clear that the petitioner will not create any hindrance in disposal of the cases, otherwise the petitioner will not be entitled to take the benefit of observation made in this order.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

A.K.V.//-

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

