

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12965 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-350 Year-2024 Thana- TRIVENIGANJ District- Supaul

1. Subodh Poddar Son of Late Surendra Poddar
 2. Manoj Poddar Son of Late Surendra Poddar
 3. Manti Devi @ Manki Devi @ Manki Wife of Late Surendra Poddar
 4. Aanand Poddar Son of Late Kari Poddar
 5. Janki Devi Wife of Aanand Poddar
- All 1 to 5 Resident of Village- Gordhai (Ward No. 04), P.S.- Triveniganj,
Distt.- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arun Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dashrath Mehta, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 05-05-2025 Heard Mr.Arun Kumar Jha, learned counsel for the

petitioners and Mr.Dashrath Mehta, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in
connection with Triveniganj P.S.Case No.350 of 2024, FIR
dated 08.09.2024 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 80(2),238(b) and 3(5) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023.

3. Allegation against the petitioners is of demanding
dowry from the deceased and due to non-fulfillment of the
same, torturing her and ultimately causing her death.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have clean antecedent and they have falsely been implicated in the present case. The allegation as alleged in the FIR is false and fabricated and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. Petitioner Nos.1 and 2 are brother-in-law and petitioner No.3 is mother-in-law of the deceased and petitioner Nos.4 and 5 are villagers of husband of deceased and they have no role at all in the present occurrence and it appears from the FIR that the informant is not the eye witness of the alleged occurrence and they have falsely been implicated in the present case.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, on the other hand, on the basis of the material available on the record and the case diary, has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that the witnesses in paragraph-35 and 36 of the case diary have supported the case of the prosecution and apart from that the petitioners have disposed of the dead body of the deceased and it appears that within four months of the marriage, the petitioners have murdered the deceased, who happens to be the daughter of the informant and they have disposed of the dead body of the deceased without informing the informant and apart from that, the Superintendent



of Police, Supaul has found the case true against the petitioners and it has come in paragraph-71 of the case diary that the Spy has informed the prosecution that the petitioners and other co-accused persons have committed the present crime in question.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and nature of allegation against the petitioners, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in connection with Triveniganj P.S.Case No.350 of 2024 pending in the court of learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate-1st, Supaul.

7. Prayer is refused.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

