

The court of 17th Distt. & Additional Sessions Judge, Muzaffarpur

B. P. NO. 766 / 2026

In the matter Of :

1. Satyendra Prasad S/O Late Soharai Bhagat

R/O Vill. - Ali Neura

PS – Minapur, District – Muzaffarur

Petitioner

Vs

The State of Bihar

Respondent

Cri. Antecedent : NIL (As per para – 3 of bail application).

(In connection with Minapur P. S. Case No. 58/ 2026)

Counsel for the petitioner : Mr. Priya Ranjan, Ld. Advocate

Counsel for the Respondent : Mr. Dharmendra Kr. Chaudhary, Ld. A. P. P.

ORDER

Dated : 29.05.2026

1. The above named petitioner seeks “Regular Bail” in connection with **Minapur P. S. Case No. 58/ 2026** for offences punishable U/S 103(1) and 3(5) BNS.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he is innocent and he had committed no offence as alleged in the FIR and been falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner had not moved anticipatory or regular bail either before this court or before Hon'ble High Court.
3. The prosecution case in brief is that the informant Chandeshwar Bhagat, in brief, is that his daughter Sunita Kumari was married with Vikash Kumar on 18.04.2013 thereafter Vikash Kumar and his family members used to demand dowry of Rs. 1 Lakh and for that they used to subject his daughter for cruelty by various means in which Vikash Kumar, Rachna Kumari, Surendra Prasad, Satyendra Prasad, Sunita Devi, Vinay Kumar, wife of Surendra Prasad were involved and on 09.02.2026 he came to know that his said daughter was done to death at her matrimonial house, he went there and found her dead body and also saw her face pierced with nail at 50 places, her neck was broken and screw driver was pierced in her neck and all the family members were absconded, dead body of her said daughter was sent to post-mortem. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as per para – 3 of bail application. There is no specific allegation against the petitioner. The petitioner is very old person. The deceased has four children all are minor and they are living with the petitioner since their father is in jail in this case. The petitioner is in custody since 08/05/2026. Hence, prayer was made for grant of bail.

4. Per contra, the Ld. A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the Ld. Court below have rightly rejected the prayer.
5. Rival contentions of the parties were heard and the record was perused. From perusal of the record it appears that marriage in this case had taken place in the year 2013 and 13 years have already passed, wherein the couple had four children from this wedlock. There is no previous litigation between the parties. In the FIR there is allegation of more than 50 marks of insertion of iron nails and broken neck, but the same is falsified by the post-mortem report. Cause of death could not be ascertained yet. FSL report is yet to be received, though more than three months have lapsed. Para – 76, 77, 78 and 79 of the case diary suggest falsity of the case and implication of the accused. The petitioner is old father in law living separately. He is having no criminal antecedent. He is in custody since 08/05/2026.
6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner do deserve the privilege of Bail and as such, prayer for bail is hereby allowed. The accused petitioner is directed to be released on execution of a bond of Rs. 10,000/- with two sureties of the like amount to be satisfaction of the Ld. Magistrate. Petition disposed off accordingly. Let the copy of this order be communicated to the concerned Court of Court No. 8 Ld. J.M.-1st, Muzaffarpur (East) for information and needful.

Sd/-

Anil K. Thakur
17th Distt. & Addl. Sessions Judge,