

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.89875 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-575 Year-2020 Thana- PAROO District- Muzaffarpur

Sonu Ram @ Sonu Kumar S/o Vishwanath Ram @ Vishwanath Rai Resident
of village- Singhai, P.S.- Paroo, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Raju Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Shubham Samrat, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 18-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Paroo P.S. Case No. 575 of 2020 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 304(B), 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that Ritu Kumari (deceased) was married to the petitioner. She was being subjected to cruelty on account of non-fulfillment of the dowry demand of a bike and one lakh rupees in cash. It is further alleged that on 17.10.2020, the informant came to know that all the in-laws had killed the deceased after pressing her neck and the dead body had been thrown in the field.



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He also submits that the marriage between the petitioner and the deceased was a love marriage, so there is no chance of demand of dowry and non-fulfillment thereof. He also submits that during the course of investigation, the witnesses have stated that after marriage, it was discovered that the deceased was pregnant prior to marriage and that the deceased had committed suicide and the in-laws had thrown the dead body in water. He also submits that it is a case of suicide. He further submits that a statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner has no criminal antecedent and he is languishing in judicial custody since 18.05.2025.

5. Countering this, the learned APP for the State submits that from perusal of the postmortem report, it is clear that the postmortem of the deceased was conducted while the body was decomposed and the doctor conducting the autopsy on the deceased has opined that there is one neck injury and the cause of death is *asphyxia* due to pressure on the neck. The petitioner is the husband and the conduct of the petitioner does not show his bonafides. Had it been a case of suicide, in that



case the dead body should not have been thrown in water. At least a postmortem should have been conducted. As the petitioner is the husband, he does not deserve the privilege of bail. A report from the learned trial court was also called and from perusal of which it is clear that till today only commitment of the case to the Session Court has been done. Even charges have not been framed.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage, however the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after six months if the trial is not concluded.

7. Learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

