

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42217 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-141 Year-2022 Thana- RAJNAGAR District- Madhubani

1. LALITA DEVI W/O GAURI SHANKAR YADAV R/O VILLAGE-SHUBHANKARPUR ANDAH, MANMOHANPUR, PS. RAJNAGAR, DIST. MADHUBANI
2. BABITA KUMARI @ BABITA DEVI W/O RAJESH KUMAR YADAV R/O VILLAGE- LAXMIPUR, PO-ATIHAR, PS. SADAR, DIST. DARBHANGA
3. SANJITA DEVI @ SANGITA DEVI W/O PRAMOD YADAV R/O VILLAGE- CHAURI, PS. PANDAUL, DIST. MADHUBANI

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Baidya Nath Thakur, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ravi Prakash, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 08-08-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State along with learned counsel for the informant.
2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304-B, 302 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and are women.
4. The informant alleges that the marriage of his sister was solemnized with Dharmendra Kumar Yadav on 21.06.2021,



but after marriage, the accused persons including the petitioners started demanding motorcycle and utensils by way of dowry. It is next alleged that on 01.06.2022 one Rampreet Yadav informed that deceased had died by hanging from ceiling fan accordingly he reached the place of occurrence and saw the dead body with mark of injury.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that petitioners are married sister-in-laws of the deceased and are living separately from Dharmendra since long, it is next submitted that whenever such occurrence takes place the entire family members, in a mechanical manner, are implicated. It is also submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence nor from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that any specific allegation is alleged against the petitioners of demanding dowry and committing torture. It is also submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence and the entire allegation, thus, hinges around suspicion.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State along with the learned counsel for the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners, but are not in a position to rebut the



submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioners that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence and they are married sisters of Dharmendra and are living separately.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Rajnagar P.S. Case No. 141 of 2022 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

