

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91829 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2025 Thana- TETERHAT District- Lakhisarai

Kamleshwari Yadav @ Bhagat Yadav S/o Pradeep Yadav R/o Village-
Jhinaura, P.S.- Tetarhat, District- Lakhisarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mayank Bilochan, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 10-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP for the State.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 80, 238, 3(5) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case, but the said case was a
complaint case and is in custody since 24.10.2025. It is next
submitted that informant alleges that his daughter was married
to Rahul in the year 2024 and at the time of marriage, the
informant by way of gift had given Rs. 6 Lakhs along with a
motorcycle and had spent an amount of Rs. 5 lakhs on food and
other articles, it is next alleged that after marriage, the named
accused persons were demanding dowry and on non-fulfillment



of the demand, the victim was tortured. It is further alleged that on 2-2-2025, the informant received an information that his daughter is ill, accordingly he reached the place of occurrence, but found the house locked and came to know that the accused had fled and the dead body of the deceased was disposed of.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and is not related with the husband of the deceased in any manner rather is a co-villager. It is next submitted that name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of Ramashish Yadav (father-in-law of the deceased) wherein he disclosed that the petitioner also participated in the cremation. The learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that since the petitioner is a co-villager, as such he was not even aware about the occurrence and on request of Ramashish and his family members, he along with other villagers participated in the occurrence. It is thus submitted that even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting, then the petitioner is not alleged to have participated in the occurrence of killing the deceased. It is next submitted that Ramashish Yadav has been granted the privilege of regular bail by a learned Co-ordinate Bench by an order dated 3-9- 2025 in Cr. Misc No. 43796 of



2025. It is further submitted that if privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the trial to prove his innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the bail application of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Tetarhat Police Station Case No. 19 of 2025.

7. Accordingly, the instant bail application is allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

