

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3083 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-249 Year-2024 Thana- BAKHTIYARPUR District- Patna

Archana Kumari W/O - Subodh Kumar R/O Vill- Raghapur, P.S-
Bakhtiyarpur, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Kashyap, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Surendra Kumar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 16-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S. Tr.
No. 1346 of 2024, arising out of Bakhtiyarpur P.S. Case No. 249
of 2024 instituted for the offence under Sections 363, 365, 302,
201, 120(B) & 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Prosecution case in short is that the son of the
informant went missing on 04-05-2024, stating he would return
shortly but never came back. Despite repeated phone calls and
searches in the local area and among relatives, his whereabouts
remain unknown.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner
that the petitioner is in custody since 07-05-2024. Petitioner



bears no criminal antecedent, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioner is not named in the FIR. Name of the petitioner has surfaced in this case during course of investigation followed by her self-confessional statement recorded by the police. There is delay of two days in lodging the FIR. No specific allegation has come forward, even in course of investigation conducted by the police. Charge sheet is submitted in this case.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. During investigation, it is revealed that petitioner was in love affair with the deceased and petitioner in connivance with other co-accused have committed the murder of the deceased. It is submitted by referring to paragraph No. 32 of the case diary, that husband of the petitioner has very categorically confessed his guilt and has stated the role of the petitioner and others in the commission of the offence, wherein, it is alleged that the petitioner attempted to conceal evidence by cleaning the bloodstains left on the road while the dead body was being transported. It is lastly submitted that eye witness has supported the prosecution case, which fact



finds mention at paragraph No.7 of the case diary.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, there being enough material against the petitioner in the case diary, this Court, at this stage, is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for grant of bail is, accordingly, *rejected*.

8. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments

9. However, petitioner will be at liberty to renew her prayer for bail if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

