

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57708 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-535 Year-2024 Thana- MOTIHARI MUFASIL District- East
Champaran

=====

Ramchandra Sahani @ Ramchandra Kumar S/o- Pathal Sahani Resident of
Bardahan Nayka Tola, P.S- Muffasil, Dist- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kundan Rathore Alias Kundan Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

6 06-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 535 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 80, 238, 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. The case of the prosecution in short is that Indu Kumari (deceased) was being killed by her in-laws. On 05.11.2024 the informant came to know about this through a telephonic message. He also came to know that all the in-laws have fled away from the house. It is alleged that after the marriage the deceased was subjected to cruelty on account of non-fulfillment of the dowry demand of a Bullet motorcycle and



Rs. 5,00,000/- in cash.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the deceased has died a natural death and that the cremation was done in the presence of the family members of the deceased, and after the cremation, this case has been filed. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the parties have compromised the case. It has also been submitted that a statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner has no criminal antecedent and he is languishing in judicial custody since 06.06.2025.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State and submits that in this case, a case diary was called for, and from perusal of the case diary, it is clear that when the I.O. visited the place of occurrence, he found that all the family members had fled away and their house was locked. From perusal of the case diary, it also transpires that the deceased had also made a video before being killed, which is said to be kept in a pen drive, but the same is not being provided to the I.O. by the informant. The deceased has admittedly died



in the matrimonial house and the conduct of the in-laws shows that they have actually committed the offence, as they have fled away from the house on the date of the occurrence itself. The deceased has also made a video but it seems that due to the compromise between the parties, the pen drive is not being provided to the I.O. by the informant. The informant and the petitioner both are in collusion whereas the deceased demands justice.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage however, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after six months if the trial is not concluded.

7. Learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial.

8. Accordingly, the present bail application of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

