

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 5484 of 2025

Vipin Kumar Yadav @Bipin Kumar Yadav aged about 28 years,
S/o-Pramod Yadav, R/o-Simrsot, Po-Kukahi, Ps - Haidarnagar,
Dist. -Palamu-822115 (Jharkhand).

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

... Opp. party

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner	: Mr. R.S.Mazumdar, Sr. Adv. Mr. Pramod Kumar, Adv. Mr. Satish Kumar, Adv.
For the State	: Ms. Anuradha Sahay, Addl. PP.

02 / 08.07.2025

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Haidarnagar P. S. case no. 72 of 2024 instituted under Section 80, 238, 3(5) of BNS, 2023.

Learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner in furtherance of the common intention with the co-accused persons, has caused dowry death of his wife and caused disappearance of the evidence of the said dowry death. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent, as mentioned in paragraph 9 of the bail application. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been in jail custody since 17.10.2024 , as mentioned in para 1 of this bail application. It is next submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with the trial of the case hence, the petitioner may be admitted to regular bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that there is direct and specific allegation against the petitioner of making persistent dowry demand of Rs. 1,00,000/- and in lieu of that, a gold chain and the undisputed fact remains that the deceased died within seven years of her marriage, otherwise than under normal circumstance, which is sufficient to constitute the offence punishable under Section 80 of BNS. It is therefore submitted that in view of the serious allegation against the petitioner, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding, if released on bail and also there is chance of the petitioner tampering with the evidence. It is therefore submitted that the petitioner ought not be released on bail at this stage.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the chance of his tampering with the evidence and absconding, if released on bail, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the above-named petitioner be released on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected at this stage.

(ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY, J.)

Smita/-