

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91017 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-37 Year-2024 Thana- RAJGIR District- Nalanda

Hira Chaudhary S/O Chotan Chaudhary R/O Vill.- Visthapit Nagdeeh,P.S-
Rajgir,Dist- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rana Baljit Singh, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 304(B) and 34 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody
since 21.11.2025. It is next submitted that informant alleges that
his daughter was married to the petitioner about two years ago,
further on 31.01.2024 he received a call on his mobile that his
daughter died by jumping in the well, thereafter he went to the
matrimonial house of his daughter, but no one was present and
saw broken utensils, food scattered all over the place and
noticed broken bangles of his daughter, thus, alleges that



accused persons killed his daughter for non-fulfillment of previous dowry demand.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence and the entire allegation hinges around suspicion. It is also submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the victim committed suicide by jumping in the well. It is also submitted that no doubt the informant alleges that when he entered the matrimonial house of the victim, he saw food articles scattered, broken utensils and noticed broken bangles, but then that in itself cannot be a ground to suspect the involvement of the petitioner in the occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that victim died within seven years of marriage and presumption in law is against the petitioner. It is further submitted that no doubt the informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence, but then it is alleged that dowry was demanded and on account of non-fulfillment of dowry demand, the victim was tortured. It is also submitted that it is the



responsibility of the husband to ensure the well being of his wife, but then it appears that the petitioner created conditions conducive for the victim to take the extreme step of ending her life.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the instant bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

