

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12460 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-182 Year-2024 Thana- TANKUPPA District- Gaya

Pinki Devi W/o Surendra Yadav Resident of Village- Gewal Bigha, P.S.-
Tankuppa, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Alok Kumar Alok, Advocate Mr. Ajay Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Kshem Sharma, Advocate Dr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate Mrs. Sweety Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Dilip Kumar No. 1, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 22-05-2025 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Tankuppa P.S. Case No. 182 of 2024, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 80, 3(5) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case is to the effect that the informant
namely, Chamari Prasad gave a report that his daughter has been
subjected to cruelty by her husband in connivance with named
accused persons including the petitioner, namely, Pinki Devi, who
happens to be her sister-in-law (gotni). It has been alleged that there
was a demand of four wheeler as dowry and subsequently, the
informant learned that due to non-fulfillment of the same, his
daughter has been done to death by her husband in connivance



with the eight named accused persons including the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is submitted that there is no eye-witness to the occurrence and even during the course of investigation, barring the statement of a spy, there is nothing to show complicity of the petitioner in the present case. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further pointed out that even from the perusal of the postmortem report it is not clear as to what was the cause of the death and the FSL report which was called by this Hon'ble Court also shows that the death of Sangita Kumari was a mystery. The learned counsel lastly submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent and she is in custody since 04.12.2024.

5. The learned counsel for the informant as well as learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and have stated that there is an allegation upon the petitioner to have killed Sangita Kumari. It has also been submitted that during the course of investigation, it has come that the petitioner had illicit relationship with the husband of the deceased and it was the husband and the present petitioner who had connived together and have killed Sangita Kumari. Learned counsel for the informant has also stated that during the course of investigation, the factum of illicit relationship of the petitioner with the husband of the



deceased had been found true and chargesheet has been submitted.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions made by the respective parties and taking into account that there is no eye-witness to the incident, the F.S.L. report does not confirm to the cause of death, which was found to be a mystery, I am inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of regular bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is allowed.

8. Let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-I, Gaya, in connection with Tankuppa P.S. Case No.182 of 2024, subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be her close relative.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates, or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.

(iv) If the petitioner is found involved in similar nature of offence in future, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of his bail bond.



(v) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Siwani/-

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

