

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9702 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-167 Year-2024 Thana- MIRGANJ District- Gopalganj

1.

Ramnath Ram Son of Late Gaurishankar Ram village- Sabeya Harijan toli, Ps- Mirganj, Dist- Gopalganj
2.

Meena Devi Wife of Ramnath Ram village- Sabeya Harijan toli, Ps- Mirganj, Dist- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Deepankar Raj, APP
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Renu Kumari, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

2 14-02-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State. Perused the case diary called for in Cr. Misc. No. 487 of 2025.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Mirganj P.S. Case No. 167 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304B, 120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, the accusation against the accused persons including the petitioners is of being involved in committing murder of the Informant’s daughter namely Chandni Kumari.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the



petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence as alleged against them and have falsely been implicated in the present case. The petitioners are in-laws of the of the deceased. There is no direct or specific allegation of any overt act against the petitioners rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. He further submits that the Informant was informed by the co-accused Gautam Kumar regarding death of the Informant's daughter and, after two days, the Informant lodged the present case implicating all family members of the petitioners. The deceased has died in the house of the Informant. There is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence. Even the Informant is not the eye-witness to the occurrence. There is also no independent witness who has supported the case of the prosecution. The petitioners have no concern with the alleged occurrence. The petitioners have no criminal antecedent as has been stated in paragraph no.3 of the present anticipatory bail application.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the co-accused have already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 20.11.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 70736 of 2024.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners, stating that the offence



alleged is serious in nature. He submits that in the postmortem report, ligature mark has been found on the neck of the deceased and the throat bone was fractured. The Informant in her re-statement in para-3 and the other witnesses in Para 4, 9 and 10 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case.

7. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case and taking into account the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, let the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Mirganj P.S. Case No. 167 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the B.N.S.S.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

