

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90651 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2025 Thana- DAWATH District- Rohtas

=====

DIPU KUMAR @ DEEPU KUMAR S/o Vimal Pal Resident of Village-
Mandhura, Police Station- Garahani, District- Bhojpur at Arra

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raghunandan Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 13-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Dawath P.S. Case No. 55 of 2025, instituted for the offences
punishable under Section 103(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the informant
found his daughter critically injured and bleeding on the rooftop
of their house, along with the petitioner. Both were taken to the
hospital, where Soni Kumari was declared dead, while the
petitioner was admitted with injuries. It is alleged that the
petitioner killed Soni Kumari with a knife and then attempted to
commit suicide by injuring himself.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner and informant's daughter were in love and both of them have tried to commit suicide. It is further submitted that the allegation levelled against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. The petitioner is in custody since 03.03.2025 and has got one criminal antecedent in which he is on bail.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that there is specific allegation of giving knife blow to the informant's daughter levelled against the petitioner. 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.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

