

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88118 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-950 Year-2023 Thana- BARACHATTI District- Gaya

Ramchandra Saw @ Tuntun Saw @ Tuntun Sao @ Ramchandra Sao S/o
Manoj Sao @ Manoj Saw R/o Village- Rajoundha, P.S- Mohanpur, Dist-
Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Munshi Sao S/o Late Bhagwat Sao R/o Village- and Post Office- Babhne,
P.S- Pratappur, Dist- Chatra (Jharkhand).

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Aryan Singh
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

6 14-05-2026 Heard Mr. Aryan Singh, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since
03.12.2024 in connection with Barachatti (Mohanpur) P.S. Case
No. 950 of 2023 for the offences punishable under Sections 341,
323, 304(B) and 34 of IPC.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, informant is
father of the deceased and has lodged an F.I.R. lodging therein
that the in-laws and husband of the deceased Sunita Devi killed
her daughter for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has clean antecedent 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. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been made an accused in this case merely on the ground that that he is husband of the deceased. It is next submitted that, in fact, the deceased has committed suicide herself and she has consumed poison and the petitioner has informed the informant about the incident and the informant has also reached the hospital in question, thereafter, the postmortem was also conducted in presence of the informant and police after investigation has submitted charge-sheet and petitioner is in custody since 03.12.2024 but the trial is not in progress.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that there is direct and specific allegation against the petitioner in the FIR and petitioner being the husband of the deceased is solely responsible for the present occurrence.

6. Vide order dated 12.01.2026, the report was called for with regard to the stage of the trial. The report of the trial court dated 27.01.2026 reveals that charge has been framed



against the petitioner and till date only one witness has been examined and the case is pending for the rest prosecution witnesses.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the report of the learned trial court, the trial has not concluded and the petitioner is in custody since 03.12.2024 i.e., one and a half years.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and report of the learned trial court as well as the period of custody, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Sessions Judge-IV, Sherghati, Gaya Ji in connection with Barachatti (Mohanpur) P.S. Case No. 950 of 2023, subject to the following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to



move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

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

