

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26280 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2025 Thana- Vasudevpur District- Munger

Shushma Devi W/O Anil Kumar R/O Village- Madhopur, P.S- Basudeopur,
Distt.- Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Raghav Prasad, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Tapeshwar Sharma, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ramsevak Choudhary, Advocate
		Mr. Shashi Sourav, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 22-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as

learned APP for the State and learned counsel appearing on

behalf of the informant.

2. In the present case, the petitioner is apprehending her arrest in connection with Basudeopur P.S. Case No. 10 of 2025 registered for the offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 69, 64, 352, 351(2) (3), 3(5) of B.N.S. and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per prosecution case, the informant was in relationship with co-accused Amit Raj for five years and petitioner is the mother of Amit Raj. The allegation is that the



marriage of the informant was fixed with co-accused Amit Raj and they established physical relationship. Subsequently, demand of dowry was made and the family of the petitioner refused to marry Amit Raj with the informant. Further allegation against the petitioner is that she threatened the informant that she would make private photographs of the informant viral by putting these on social media.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner is a lady and has no concern with the activities of her son. Being the mother of Amit Raj, she has been falsely implicated in this case. The story of fixing marriage of co-accused with the informant is completely false and concocted and allegation of petitioner threatening to make private photographs viral is completely false. When there is no talk of marriage, there is no question of demand of dowry. The petitioner is having clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant vehemently oppose the submission made on behalf of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the petitioner threatened the informant that she would put her



private photographs on social media in order to defame her. Learned counsel further submits that if the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, co-accused would continue of doing all sorts of wrongful acts.

6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances and submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the fact that the thrust of allegation is against co-accused and there is no serious allegation against the petitioner and also considering the fact that she is a lady and is having clean antecedent, let the petitioner above named, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the court concerned within a period of eight weeks from today, be released on bail, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Munger/concerned court in connection with Basudeopur P.S. Case No. 10 of 2025, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. and other following conditions:

- (i) One of the bailors will be a close relative of the petitioner.
- (ii) The petitioner will remain present on each and every date fixed by the



court below, if so required by the
learned trial court.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

DKS/-

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

