

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91980 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-61 Year-2025 Thana- LAUKARIA District- West Champaran

Rahul Yadav @ Rahul Kumar Yadav Son of Gabbar @ Krishna Yadav @
Gabbar yadav Resident of Village- Jarar Police Station -Laukariya, Dist- West
Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Perna Anand, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 03-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 80(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody
since 02.06.2025 and the informant alleges that his daughter
was married to the petitioner on 26.02.2024 and after marriage
the accused persons including the petitioner were demanding
Rs.4 lakhs and a car. Further, on 27.05.2025, the informant came
to know that his daughter has been killed, accordingly, he
reached the place of occurrence and saw the dead body of his
daughter lying and the accused persons had fled, thus, alleges
that accused persons including the petitioner killed his daughter.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence and the entire allegation hinges around suspicion. It is next submitted that no doubt, the allegation is of demand of dowry of Rs.4 lakhs and a car but then the allegation is general and omnibus in nature. It is also submitted that the daughter of the informant was married to the petitioner on 26.02.2024 but then no case prior to the occurrence came to be instituted either by the deceased or the informant alleging that the victim was being tortured for non-fulfillment of the dowry demand.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner is the husband and the marriage of the deceased with the petitioner was performed on 26.02.2024 and within one year of marriage, the victim was killed, as such, in law even the presumption is against the husband, more so, when the dead body was recovered from the house of the petitioner. It is further submitted that no doubt, the informant is not an eyewitness but then the postmortem report records the cause of death as



asphyxia on account of strangulation.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail in connection with Laukariya P.S. Case No. 61 of 2025 pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Bagaha, West Champaran/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

