

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32202 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-98 Year-2020 Thana- MEHANDIGANJ District- Patna

1. RINKU DEVI, W/o Anand Mohan Prasad Singh R/o Mohalla- Kanchanpur, P.S.- Bidupur, District- Vaishali
2. Nidhi Kumari D/o Anand Mohan Prasad Singh R/o Mohalla- Kanchanpur, P.S.- Bidupur, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Aditya Nath Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Anbzarul, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

3 25-04-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioners is directed to remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the State.

The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in connection with Mehndiganj P. S. Case No. 98 of 2020, instituted for the offences under Sections 302 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

As per allegation, the informant got an information



that her husband is lying in a pool of blood. She rushed there and carried her husband to PMCH, where he was declared as dead.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in her fard-beyan, she did not name the accused persons but in her second petition given to SHO, she has named the petitioners.

On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, Mr. J. N. Thakur opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that during the course of investigation the person who killed the deceased was arrested and he rendered his self-inculpatory confessional statement and also stated that he was in love and affair with petitioner no. 2. The deceased, Niranjana Kumar was Mausa of petitioner no. 2 and he was not providing permission for his relation with petitioner no. 2. It was the reason that he killed the deceased.

During the course of investigation, the CDR of the mobile phone of Nidhi Kumari was obtained by the Investigating Authorities, which is annexed with the case-diary, which shows that before the occurrence, petitioner no.



2 had conversations with the accused, Rohit Kumar. The petitioner no. 2 had provided location of the deceased to him.

It has also emerged during course of investigation that petitioner no. 1, who is the mother of petitioner no. 2, is also involved in hatching conspiracy.

Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, I do not think it to be a fit case for anticipatory bail.

The anticipatory bail application is rejected accordingly.

Office shall ensure that all the defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time provided in para 1 hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

skm/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

