

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7255 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-292 Year-2024 Thana- DARIYAPUR District- Saran

Most. Mahamuni Kuwar @ Chinta Devi @ Meharmuni Devi @ Mohar Muni
Devi, Wife of Late Kishan Deo Ram, Resident of Village - Jhauna Tola,
Khajuhatta, P.O. - Dariyapur, District - Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Dr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uma Shankar Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 05-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. In the present case, the petitioner is apprehending her arrest in connection with Dariyapur P.S. Case No. 292 of 2024, registered for the offences under Sections 302, 304(B), 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, dowry death of the sister of the informant was committed by the petitioner and other co-accused person.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. No occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. The sister of the informant died due to illness and the informant and her family members joined the last rites, but the present case has



been lodged in order to extort money from the petitioner. The allegation is quite general and vague and there is no eye witness to the alleged occurrence. The learned counsel further submits that the co-accused husband of the deceased sister of the informant has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 22.01.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No.77705 of 2024.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the submission made on behalf of the petitioner. The learned APP submits that there is specific allegation of causing dowry death against the petitioner and co-accused husband, who has been granted regular bail and not the anticipatory bail. Moreover, process under Section 83 Cr. P.C. has been executed against the petitioner and, as such, the present anticipatory bail is not maintainable.

6. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, her prayer for grant of anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

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

