

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.7818 of 2018**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-258 Year-2017 Thana- RIGA District- Sitamarhi

- 
1. Sharda Devi, Wife of Khehru Mahto,
  2. Khehru Mahto, Son of Khelawan Mahto,
  3. Inarjeet Kumar @ Inarjit Mahto, Son of Khehru Mahto,
  4. Indal Kumar, Son of Khehru Mahto,
  5. Bahadur Mahto @ Bahadue Mahto, Son of Khehru Mahto,
  6. Shila Devi @ Bechani Devi, Daughter of Khehru Mahto,
  7. Hari Mahto, Son of Fakira Mahto,
  8. Mohan Mahto, Son of Khelawan Mahto,
- All R/o Riga Imali Bazar, Ward No.11, Nunia Toli, P.S.- Riga,  
District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

---

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                                |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Ashok Kumar Jha, Adv.      |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Rajballabh Singh, APP      |
| For the Informant        | : | Mr. Pushpendra Kr. Singh, Adv. |

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      19-04-2018                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned  
counsel for the State.

In this case, the petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Riga P.S. Case No. 258 of 2017 registered for offences under sections 302, 201, 120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per First Information Report, the deceased was married with Shila Devi @ Bechani Devi, there was a strained relationship between them, Shila Devi often used to staying in her parents' house. On the eve of Mahabiri Jhanda, the wife and



in-laws called the deceased, he went to his Sasural, on the fateful day, he was found hanging on the tree.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there is no eyewitness as none has seen the occurrence. The petitioner no.1 and 6 are the mother-in-law and wife of the deceased respectively and they may be granted anticipatory bail.

The deceased has gone on the call of his wife and from the case diary, it appears that there was no mud attached to the bottom of the leg of the deceased although there was a rain on the last day and also there was sufficient mud at the place of occurrence which shows that something wrong has been done with the deceased.

Looking to the entire facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners, above named, is rejected.

**(Shivaji Pandey, J)**

rishi/-

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

