

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6294 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-117 Year-2024 Thana- SAHEBPUR KAMAL District-
Begusarai

=====

Rinku Devi @ Pinku Devi W/o Mohan Ray R/o Village- Raghunathpur, PS-
Sahebpur Kamal, Distt- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shivendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate Mr. Ranjeet Patel, Advocate Mr. Avnish Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, APP
For the informant	:	Mr. Sandip Kumar Gautam, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 19-02-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Sahebpur Kamal P.S. Case No. 117 of 2024, dated 27.04.2024
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498A,
304B read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per allegation, the petitioner and other co-
accused have committed dowry death of daughter of the
informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this
case. He further submits that the petitioner is mother-in-law of



the deceased. He further submits that it is not a dowry death, in fact it is a case of suicide. He further submits that the written report is typed with thumb impression of the informant's father. He further submits that this typed written report has been given after two days without any explanation. All the three co-accused, namely, Khushi Kumari, Amit Kumar and Abhiram Kumar, who are her sister and brother-in-law respectively, have already been exonerated by the police after investigation.

5. He further submits that the petitioner has been languishing in jail since 22.10.2024.

6. It has also been stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

7. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one.

8. However, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant vehemently oppose the prayer of the petitioner for bail submitting that the petitioner is mother-in-law of the deceased and as per the medical report, cause of death is strangulation. They further submit that as per the FIR, the death of the victim has been caused in the absence of the husband,



meaning thereby that there is active role of the other-accused, including the petitioner, who is mother in-law, because without involvement of more than one person, strangulation cannot be possible of a human being and finding the case true against the petitioner, the charge-sheet has been submitted.

9. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the serious nature of the offence, I am not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

10. Accordingly, the present bail petition is hereby rejected.

11. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a lady and she may give liberty to renew her prayer after framing of charge.

12. Accordingly, the petitioner is at liberty to renew her prayer after framing of charge.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

shoaib/-

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

