

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88845 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-211 Year-2023 Thana- ROHTAS District- Rohtas

Vijay Pal S/O Rajendra Pal R/O Village- Pakariya, P.S- Akodhigola, Distt.-
Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 06-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail, apprehending his arrest,
in connection with Rohtas P.S. Case No. 211 of 2023 dated
16.08.2023, registered for the offences punishable under Section
304(B) read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per allegation, the victim was married with the
petitioner in the year, 2014 and after the marriage, she joined the
matrimonial home of her husband/petitioner herein. However,
additional demand of dowry started and on account of non-
fulfillment of the same, the petitioner and other family members
started torturing the victim. It is further alleged that on
04.08.2023, the victim was badly assaulted by the petitioner-
husband and his family members and she was taken to parental



home where she was getting treatment, but in course of treatment, she died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that both parents-in-law have got anticipatory bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court. He further submits that it is not a case of dowry death and the victim has died at her *maike* in course of treatment.

5. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one in the instant case.

6. It has further been stated in paragraph no.3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has one criminal antecedent.

7. However, learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the Petitioner for bail submitting that the petitioner is the husband of the victim and due to assault by him and his family members, she died in course of treatment. Hence, it is a case of murder rather than dowry death, though it is related with non-fulfillment of illegal demand of dowry. But as per the allegation, there is dying declaration by the petitioner-husband to the informant-brother. Hence, this is not a fit case for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who is



husband of the victim.

8. Considering the fact that as per allegation, the deceased had died on account of assault committed by the petitioner and his family members, I am not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

9. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner is hereby **rejected**.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

shoaib/-

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

