

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Criminal Miscellaneous No.5710 of 2017**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -74 Year- 2016 Thana -PIPRAHI District- SHEOHAR

=====

1. Renu Devi Wife of Baidyanath Pathak,  
2. Baidyanath pathak, Son of Late Bhabhikhan Pathak, Both Resident of  
Village-Haspur, P.S.-Piprahi, District-Shohar.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... .... Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kumar Alok, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mustaque Alam, A.P.P.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      01-03-2017                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the  
  
learned A.P.P. for the State.

Petitioners are languishing in judicial custody since  
14.09.2016 in connection with Piprahi P. S. Case No. 74 of 2016  
Sessions Trial No. 1/2017 registered for the offence punishable  
under Sections 302, 201, 379/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case is that the daughter of the  
informant was married to one Raju Pathak, son of the petitioners,  
who are mother-in-law and father-in-law of the deceased and the  
daughter of the informant was blessed with five daughters and one  
son, as a result the husband of the deceased and the in-laws used  
to torture her and on 14.09.2016, he got the information that his



daughter was done to death by her in-laws and her dead body had been cremated.

It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that they are innocent have no criminal antecedents and charge sheet have been submitted, hence there is no chance of tampering with the prosecution evidence. It has further been submitted that the petitioners are in custody since 14.09.2016 and the husband is in custody who had confessed that on the previous night, he had a quarrel with his wife and as a consequence, he pressed her neck due to which she died.

However, learned A.P.P. for the State submits that the petitioner is named in the First Information Report, hence, opposes the prayer for bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances, since the husband of the deceased is in Judicial custody and the petitioners are father-in-law and mother-in-law respectively, let the petitioners, above named, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Sessions Judge, Sheohar in connection with Piprahi P. S. Case No. 74 of 2016 Sessions Trial No. 1 of 2017, subject to the condition that the petitioners are directed to appear before the police/ Court



on each and every date and failure to appear before the Court below on two consecutive dates without assigning any reason will entail cancellation of their bail bonds.

**(Nilu Agrawal, J)**

Sudha/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

