

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91638 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-358 Year-2024 Thana- MURLIGANJ District- Madhepura

Mithilesh Kumar, S/O Ram Chandra Yadav, R/O Village- Jahagir Tola, Ward
No. 15, P.S- Murliganj, Distt.- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms.Pooja Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kumar Veerendra Narayan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 06-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. In the present case, the petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sessions Trial No. 20 of 2025, arising out of Murliganj P.S. Case No. 358 of 2024, registered for the alleged offences under Sections 80, 3(5) of BNS and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner was married with the daughter of the informant in the year 2018 and birth of two daughters took place out of this wedlock. Further allegation against the petitioner is that he had been demanding Rs. 1 lakh and on non-fulfillment of demand, his wife was driven out from her matrimonial home. On 03.08.2024, the informant brought her back to her matrimonial home wherein on



04.08.2024 she was assaulted by the petitioner and others and they also assaulted the informant and, thereafter, the petitioner and his family members put a rope in the neck of the daughter of the informant and killed her.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this is the second attempt of the petitioner to seek bail from this Court. Earlier, the prayer for bail of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 13.05.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 6163 of 2025. The learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 10.08.2024, but the trial has not been concluded till date and there is no likelihood of early conclusion of trial. The learned counsel further submits that the wife of the petitioner committed suicide and prior to that there was cordial relationship with the petitioner and his deceased wife. There were two children from this wedlock.

5. The learned APP vehemently opposes the submission made on behalf of the petitioner. The learned APP submits that no fresh ground has been brought on record for reconsideration of prayer of bail and the period of custody could not be a ground.

6. A report dated 15.01.2026 has been received from the learned trial court about the present stage of trial wherein the



learned trial court has submitted that the matter has been pending for recording the statement of accused persons under Section 313 Cr.P.C. The learned trial court has further submitted that there is every possibility of conclusion of trial within next three months.

7. Having regard to the facts and circumstances and submission made on behalf of the parties, I do not find any new ground to reconsider the prayer for bail of the petitioner. Hence, his prayer for grant of bail is rejected.

8. However, the learned trial court is directed to abide by its undertaking and dispose of the matter at the earliest.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

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

