

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82825 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-138 Year-2024 Thana- KUTUMBA District- Aurangabad

1. Shrikant Mehta @ Shrikant Verma S/O Vinod Mehta Vill.- Dadhapa, P.S.- Kutumba, Dist.- Aurangabad.
2. Bindu Devi Wife of Shrikant Mehta @ Shrikant Verma Vill.- Dadhapa, P.S.- Kutumba, Dist.- Aurangabad.
3. Neha Kumari D/O Shrikant Mehta @ Shrikant Verma Vill.- Dadhapa, P.S.- Kutumba, Dist.- Aurangabad.
4. Sanoj Kumar S/O Shrikant Mehta @ Shrikant Verma Vill.- Dadhapa, P.S.- Kutumba, Dist.- Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Nitu Kumari  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Aslam Ansari

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      10-12-2024                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Parmanand Prasad, learned APP for the State.

2. The instant application for anticipatory bail have been filed by the petitioners apprehending their arrest in connection with Kutumba P.S. Case No. 138 of 2024 instituted for the offence under Sections 80, 3(5) of B.N.S. 2023.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the sister of the informant namely, Sarita Devi was married to Rahul Kumar alias Anuj Kumar and the *gauna* was performed in the year 2015. She is having two issues. It is further alleged that she was



being subjected to cruelty of non-fulfillment of dowry demand. On 10.08.2024 the informant received a call from one mobile number that his sister has been killed. On this information, he went to the matrimonial house of the deceased.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners have submitted that petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence. They have falsely been implicated in this case. It is also submitted that present petitioners are father-in-law, mother-in-law and sister-in-law. There is general and omnibus allegation against the all in-laws in FIR. During course of argument, learned counsel for the petitioners have also submitted that the informant has given an application in the trial court to the effect that Rahul Kumar (brother-in-law of the informant) was living separate from his parents and his brother and sister. Since informant himself has admitted that the petitioners were separate from the husband of the deceased in that case, there seems no role of the petitioner in the occurrence. Petitioner has got no criminal antecedent.

5. In contra, learned APP appearing for the State opposes the prayer of bail of the petitioners.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and in the facts and circumstances of the case as stated above, this



Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. The petitioners are directed to surrender in the Court below within a period of four weeks from today and in the event of their arrest or surrender in connection with Kutumba P.S. Case No. 138 of 2024, they will be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Judicial Magistrate 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Aurangabad subject to the conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

**(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)**

Sudhanshu/-

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

