

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75399 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-72 Year-2025 Thana- PIYAR District- Muzaffarpur

Raghubir Sah @ Raghuvir Sah S/o Bhagyanarayan Sah Resident of Village-
Govindpur Chapra, P.S.- Piyar, Distt.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sumit Jha, Adv.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

4 18-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. A prayer for bail has been made on behalf of the petitioner in connection with Piyar P.S. Case no.72 of 2025 registered under sections 115(2), 126(2), 103(1), 85 and 3(5) of BNS, 2023.

3. Allegation in the F.I.R is that petitioner along with his family members killed the informant's daughter on non-fulfillment of demand of dowry.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the deceased happens to be the wife of the petitioner and the marriage dates back to the year 2015 i.e. 10 years prior to the date of occurrence, although it has been stated in the F.I.R that she was being ill treated by the petitioner and other accused



persons, however, there has been no earlier complaint of any cruelty being meted out to her. Further, it is an admitted fact, as per F.I.R itself, that the petitioner was at Allahabad where he had taken the deceased along with him but had reached her back to house of the informant and the informant also accepts that for the past year, the deceased had been at his house and it was only on 25.04.2025 that she went to her matrimonial home upon being called by her mother-in-law. Upon information being received on 21.05.2025 that the informant's daughter had died in the matrimonial home, he reached there where two other accused persons, namely, Ajay Kumar and Lalit Thakur were found in abusive condition and allegedly extended threats, claiming responsibility for the murder of the deceased. F.I.R further discloses that informant only has belief and suspicion that the said act has been done at the instance of the petitioner. Learned counsel has also drawn attention to the postmortem report showing the finding in the external examination of that of an abrasion on the right side of the neck with some haemorrhagic spots near the eyes. The opinion regarding cause of death was kept preserved till the chemical analysis of viscera but as a matter of fact not only charge-sheet was submitted but even charges have been framed without the FSL report being



there on record. The petitioner is in custody since 22.05.2025 and charges have been framed in the case but no witness has been examined till now and hence, there is no likelihood to conclude the trial in the near future. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and undertakes to cooperate in the case/trial.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State on the ground that petitioner is the husband of the deceased and he is primarily responsible for the welfare of his wife.

6. Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that petitioner was not even present at the place of occurrence, as admitted by the prosecution case itself and the allegation being based on suspicion and belief, coupled with the fact that charges have already been framed with no likelihood of trial being concluded in near future, the petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail in connection with Piya P.S. Case no.72 of 2025 on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court concerned where the case is pending/successor Court, subject to the further condition that the petitioner shall remain



physically present in the learned trial Court on each date and shall cooperate in the trial. In case the petitioner is absent on the two consecutive dates without sufficient reasons, the learned trial Court would be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Harsh/-

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

