

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.62279 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2021 Thana- PIPRA District- Patna

SANGEETA DEVI, Wife of Late Niraj Kewat, D/o Late Raguni Kewat
Resident of Village- Sheikhpur, P.S.- Pipra, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pranaya Shanker Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 11-04-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Pipra P.
S. Case No. 10 of 2021 (Gr. No. 84 of 2021), instituted for the
offences under Sections 323, 302, 504/34 of the Indian Penal
Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is in custody since 25.01.2021, charge-sheet has been
submitted and is the person with clean antecedent.

The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits
that the informant alleges that her son (deceased) did not come
out of his room in the morning, hence, she suspected that his
wife (petitioner) has done something because they were
quarreling last night and the informant had heard some unusual
sound, further, when the informant opened the door, she saw the
mark of violence on the face and body of the deceased and the
petitioner was missing from the place of occurrence. It is further
alleged that petitioner is in relationship with the accused persons
namely Rinku Yadav and Pintu Sao. It is also alleged that her
son had sold some land for which Rinku and Pintu used to come



his house till night. It is alleged that petitioner along with Rinku Yadav and Pintu Sao killed her son.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. The informant is not an eye-witness of the occurrence and no wife would kill her own husband after having three children and living with him for so long.

Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant opposes the bail application and submits that it appears from the FIR that the petitioner along with the deceased were in the room and were quarreling and in the morning petitioner was missing and subsequently son of the informant was found dead. It is thus submitted that circumstances in which the dead body was found leads to a strong inference that the petitioner is involved in the present case.

Learned APP for the State also submits that after perusal of the case diary it appears that petitioner has also accepted in her confessional statement about her participation in the occurrence along with Rinku Yadav and Pintu Sao.

In view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the informant as well as learned APP for the State and the present stage of trial, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

The application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

khushbu/-

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

