

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88258 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-398 Year-2025 Thana- NAUTAN District- West Champaran

Jhunna Ansari Son of Mobarak Ansari Resident of Village - Maduwaha Tola
Sihuliya, P.S.- Nautan, District - West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Umesh Chandra Verma, Advocate
	:	Mr. Hemant Ray, Advocate
	:	Mr. Sharad Kumar Verma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	:	Mr. Binod Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 01-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since 14.08.2025 in connection with Nautan P.S. Case No. 398 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 238 and 3(5) of BNS.

3. The prosecution story, in brief, is that on 12.08.2025, at about 12:10 midday, the informant, Bhikhari Sahani son of Late Tilakdhari Sahani, resident of village- Dakshin Telhua, Sati Tola, P. S.- Nautan, District- West Champaran, submitted typed report before the S. H. O. of Nautan P.S. alleging therein that his daughter was married to Brajesh Sahani about 09 years ago, and she was blessed with



three children. Her husband had developed illicit relation with his 'bhabhi', and on protest by his daughter, all the 11 named accused persons including the petitioner figuring accused no. 9 used to torture her committing *marpit* with her. On 09.08.2025, at about 10.00 p. m. in the night, while her husband was sleeping with his 'bhabhi', his daughter raised objection, and then they caused her death, and disappeared the dead body. On 10.08.2025, while the informant was trying to find out about the assailant, some people asking him to keep their names secret, and said that they had disappeared her dead body after killing her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the allegation as alleged in the FIR is forged and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that petitioner is neither the family member of the husband of the deceased nor relative of the in-laws of the deceased. It is next submitted that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner in the present matter.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the



State on the basis of materials available on record and the case dairy has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the co-accused namely, Brijesh Sahani, who is happened to be husband of the deceased as stated in paragraph-33 of the case diary that the petitioner was involved in the present crime in question along with co-accused Brijesh Sahani and on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Brijesh Sahani, the dead body of the victim was recovered, so confessional statement of co-accused person cannot be disbelieved in the present case

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail in connection with Nautan P.S. Case No. 398 of 2025 pending in the learned SDJM, West Champaran at Bettiah.

7. Prayer is refused.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

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

