

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50533 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-33 Year-2024 Thana- KHAJALI District- Madhubani

Ranjan Kumari @ Ranjana Devi @ Ranjan Devi Wife of Naveen Kumar @
Naveen Kumar Ram @ Ran R/O- Village- Hathiyahi, P.S.- Khajauli, Distt.-
Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gagandeo Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Ravi Prakash, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajendra Nath Jha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 12-11-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State. Perused the case diary called for in Cr.
Misc. No. 51013 of 2024.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection
with Khajauli P.S. Case No. 33 of 2024 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 302, 201, 120(B)/34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, the accusation against the
accused persons including the petitioner is of committing
murder of the Informant's son.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged
against her and has falsely been implicated in the present case



merely on the basis of suspicion. There is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence. The petitioner is a lady and is suffering from several ailments. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is different versions with respect to recovery of the dead body which creates doubt in the prosecution case as from the FIR, it appears that the dead body was lying in the wheat field whereas the inquest report shows that the dead body was recovered from the mango garden. The F.I.R. has been lodged after preparation of the postmortem report. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as has been stated in paragraph no.3 of the present anticipatory bail application.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, contending that there is lot of evidence to show the complicity of the petitioner of being involved in the alleged occurrence. In the F.I.R. itself, it has been stated that the deceased had illicit relationship with the petitioner and on 01.03.2024, she called the deceased to her home and, under conspiracy, in association with other miscreants, killed him. The witnesses in their statement at Paras 8, 9 & 10 have supported the prosecution case. The postmortem report also fully corroborates the version of the F.I.R.

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the



learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds that the present case is not a fit case for anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected. If the petitioner surrenders before the court below within a period of four weeks from today and prays for regular bail, the same would be considered by the court below in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

