

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59601 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-192 Year-2023 Thana- MAHUA District- Vaishali

=====

Digvijay Singh S/o Maharana Pratap Singh R/o Village - Harpur Belwa, P.S -
Mahua, District - Vaishali, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, Advocate

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

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 25-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 304B, 201 and 34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody
since 03.11.2023 and has been falsely implicated in the instant
case by the informant being husband of the deceased. It is next
submitted that Maharana Pratap Singh, the father-in-law of the
deceased, had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail
by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No.36089 of 2024 and the
same came to be allowed by an order dated 19.06.2024 after
considering the case in detail and on merits. It is further



submitted that while granting the privilege of anticipatory bail to Maharana Pratap Singh, this Court at para-6 had recorded that “It is also submitted that the police during the course of investigation recorded the statement of Dr. A.K. Singh who treated that deceased prior to her death who stated that the deceased was brought to his nursing home in a serious condition and he treated her but on account of cardiac arrest she died and he issued the death certificate. It is also submitted that the doctor also handed over the treatment which was meted out to the deceased by him as has come at para-45 of the case diary.” Further at para-5 it has been recorded that petitioner, i.e., (husband of the deceased) on 30.03.2023 at 12:26 p.m. called the son of the informant on his mobile informing him about the condition of his sister and the talk in between the husband of the deceased, i.e., petitioner and his brother-in-law lasted for 107 seconds as has come in the case diary at para-85. Thus, informant and his son were aware of the condition of the wife of the petitioner as informed by the petitioner but they did not rush immediately thinking that doctor are attending. It is next submitted that the deceased was married to the petitioner in the year 2018 and the instant case came to be instituted in the year 2023, i.e., five years of marriage and out of the wedlock a child



was born and is being looked after by the grand parents, i.e., parents of the petitioner. It is also submitted that in between 2018 till 2023, no case ever came to be instituted either by the informant or the deceased alleging demand of dowry and torture. It is next submitted that no doubt the death took place within seven years of marriage but then all deaths are not dowry deaths and the doctor during the course of investigation certified that the victim was brought to his nursing home in a serious conditions and she died on account of cardiac arrest and a death certificate was issued as recorded at para-45 of the case diary. It is also submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the trial to prove his innocence.

4. Learned APP opposes the bail application.

5. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and taking into consideration the order dated 19.06.2024, passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No.36089 of 2024, let petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vaishali at Hajipur in connection with Mahua P.S. Case No.192 of 2023.

6. It is made clear that if the learned Trial Court



comes to a conclusion that petitioner is trying to delay the framing of charge or after framing of charge is trying to delay the trial in any manner, in both the conditions, the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bond of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sanjay/-

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

