

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13560 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-288 Year-2024 Thana- KAKO District- Jehanabad

Bechani Devi W/O Late Uday Yadav Village- Satan Pur, P.S.- Kako, Dist.-
Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Syed alamdar Hussain, Advocate
	:	Mr. Ashutosh Kumar Mishra, Advocate
	:	Mr. Alok Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mrs. Renu Kumari, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4 29-08-2025 Heard Mr. Rajeev Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mrs. Renu Kumari, learned APP for the State.

Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection
with Kako P.S. Case No. 288 of 2024 instituted for the offences
under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023.

3. 3. Prosecution story, in short, is that, the informant's
father and one Kashi Prasad were taken by accused persons
including the petitioners and later found dead near Arbind
Singh's cabin.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the



petitioner is an innocent lady and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. The name of the petitioner transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement of the co-accused Arbind Kumar which has no evidentiary value in the eye of law. No specific overt act is alleged against the petitioner. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that the name of the petitioner has transpired on the basis of confessional statement of the co-accused Arbind Kumar who has specifically stated that the accused persons including him committed the murder of the deceased on the direction of this petitioner. She further submitted that post-mortem report also supports the prosecution case. Learned APP further submitted that investigation is still going on against the petitioner and police, in the supervision note, have mentioned the complicity of the petitioner in the alleged occurrence. Learned APP, therefore, prayed that the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of offence as also since



investigation is still pending against the petitioner, in my view, this is not a fit case for anticipatory bail, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the learned court below within a period of six weeks from today and prays for regular bail, the same shall be disposed of on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

