**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32066 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-204 Year-2025 Thana- BASOPATTI District- Madhubani

==========

Manohar Yadav S/o Chandraveer Yadav R/o Village - Panchratan, PS - Basopatti, District - Madhubani

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

**Appearance :**
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gagan Deo yadav, Advocate
Mr. Ravi Prakash, Advocate
Mr. Rohit Kant Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Naresh Ray, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Subhash Kumar Jha, Advocate
Mr. Prakash Kumar, Advocate

==========

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

6 20-08-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for the State, learned counsel for the informant and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Basopatti P.S. Case No. 204 of 2025, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 103, 238, 61(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner and his family members allegedly subjected the deceased to dowry-related cruelty and harassment, including a demand for a motorcycle, and thereafter, in furtherance of their common intention, murdered her and burnt her dead body to screen the

WEB COPY

offence and destroy evidence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is husband of the deceased. There is delay of two days in lodging the FIR. It is next submitted that the petitioner was not present at the spot when the alleged occurrence took place. The petitioner was working at Tinsukiya (Assam). It is further submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged against him. The petitioner is in custody since 27.11.2025 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the witnesses at paragraph nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case and have also stated about demand of dowry and torture meted out to the deceased. It is further submitted that specific allegation has been attributed against the petitioner. Further the petitioner is husband of the deceased and, therefore, onus lies upon him to explain the cause of death.

WEB COPY

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected.

**(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)**

Rajorshi/-

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **U** | | T | |

WEB COPY