

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90349 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-168 Year-2024 Thana- JANDAHA District- Vaishali

Monu Kumar @ Monu Paswan, Son of Bharat Paswan, Resident of Village - Mukundpur Bhath, Police Station - Jandaha, District - Vaishali at Hajipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Prakash Paswan, Son of Ram Babu Paswan, R/O Village - Kasturi Sarai, P.S.- Harilochanpur (Patepur), District - Vaishali at Hajipur

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sachin Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uday Pratap Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 11-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioner, who is in custody, seeks bail in connection with Jandaha P.S. Case No. 168 of 2024 (Sessions Trial No.628 of 2025) registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304(B), 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is that he had killed his wife and had thrown away her dead-body.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and in fact his deceased wife was suffering from tuberculosis and on account of such disease, she had died. It has further been submitted that



the confessional statement of the petitioner was taken by force and no such statement was made by the petitioner before the police. It has next been submitted that there was no previous demand of dowry and no complaint whatsoever was ever made by the deceased or her family members prior to the said incident. It has also been submitted that the petitioner has been made accused merely on presumption. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner carries clean antecedent and he is in custody since 29.06.2024.

5. The learned A.P.P. has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and has stated that the conduct of the petitioner being the husband of the deceased becomes doubtful, especially for the fact that the victim, the wife of the petitioner, died on account of some disease, he ought to have brought on record some medical prescription to show she was undergoing any treatment. It has also been submitted that the body of the wife of the petitioner was also disposed off without informing the family of the deceased wife.

6. Considering the aforesaid submission and taking into account the fact that the petitioner happens to be the husband and the death took place in mysterious circumstances, I am not inclined to release the petitioner on bail for the present.



7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is rejected and the application stands dismissed.

8. The petitioner may renew his prayer for bail as and when advised.

9. It is made clear that the observation, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/-

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

