

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80356 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-449 Year-2025 Thana- DARIYAPUR District- Saran

Laldeo Mahto Son of Krishna Mahto Resident Of Village -Tarwan Mangarpal,
Ps -Dariyapur, Dist- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prabhat Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Amitesh Kumar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 11-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Dariyapur P.S. Case No. 449 of 2025, instituted for the offences
punishable under Sections 80 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that daughter of
the informant has been done to death by her husband and in-
laws for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the
present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case.
Learned counsel for the petitioner also submitted that the



petitioner is husband of the deceased and their marriage was solemnized nine years ago. It is next submitted that the petitioner has never made any demand of dowry from the deceased. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that the petitioner as being husband of the deceased has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is in custody since 14.07.2025 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submitted that there is specific allegation levelled against the petitioner. It is further submitted that in paragraph nos. 3 and 4 of the case diary, it transpires that the witnesses have supported the prosecution case. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of four months from the date of receipt/production, the



petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the
Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

