

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**B.A. No. 8564 of 2026**

Ajeet Yadav @ Ajit Yadav, aged about 28 years, S/o Prakash Yadav,
R/o village – Nawada, P.O. – Sharmatand, P.S. – Jainagar, District
Koderma, Jharkhand **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Mritunjay Choudhary, Advocate
: Mr. Indra Bhushan Prasad Sinha, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Rajesh Kumar, APP

03/16.09.2026

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Jainagar P.S. Case No.89 of 2026 (S.T. Case No.98 of 2026), registered under Sections 80 (2), 3 (5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and further cognizance for the offence under Section 108 of the BNS has been taken, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge – III at Koderma.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased, who died within one year of marriage in her matrimonial home. He submits that though F.I.R. was lodged under Section 80 (2) of BNS read with Section 3 (5) of BNS, but charge has been framed under Section 108 of BNS. He submits that there was dispute between the deceased and her sister-in-law due to which she committed suicide. He has further submitted that the petitioner being the husband was working outside, and therefore, he has no role to play in the alleged offence.

4. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that there is direct allegation of demand of dowry and numerous injuries were also found on the body of the deceased. In such circumstances, the petitioner, being the husband, may not be enlarged on bail.

5. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and

considering the fact that the deceased died in her matrimonial home under un-natural circumstances within 1 year of marriage, coupled with the fact that there is demand of dowry and torture as alleged in the F.I.R., this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

6. At this, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that some observation may be made so that the trial is expedited.

7. The State is directed to ensure that the witnesses are promptly produced before the court.

8. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Superintendent of Police of the concerned district and also to Director, Prosecution to ensure compliance.

9. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through "FAX/email".

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order: **16.09.2026**

Saurav

Date of Uploading: 17.09.2026