

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33509 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-333 Year-2024 Thana- GHANSHYAMPUR District- Darbhanga

1.

Sudhira Devi @ Anjila Devi W/O Baua Jha @ Baua Resident of village Jaideopatti, P.S.- Ghanshyampur, Dist.- Darbhanga.
2.

Baua Jha @ Baua S/O Jainarayan Jha Resident of village Jaideopatti, P.S.- Ghanshyampur, Dist.- Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 33036 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-333 Year-2024 Thana- GHANSHYAMPUR District- Darbhanga

Rahul Jha S/O Baua Jha @ Baua Resident of village Jaideopatti, P.S.- Ghanshyampur, Dist.- Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 33509 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Birendra Kant Choudhary, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Syed Ehteshamuddin, APP

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 33036 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Birendra Kant Choudhary, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Humayou Ahmad Khan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KHATIM REZA
ORAL ORDER

306-08-2025

Both cases have been taken up and heard together as they arise out of the same PS Case number and are disposed of by this common order.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State



3. The petitioners seek bail in connection with Ghanshyampur P.S. Case No. 333 of 2024, dated 14-11-2024, registered for offences punishable under Sections 80 and 238 of the *Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita*.

4. The prosecution case, as stated in the written application of the informant, namely Nunu Jha, in short, is that his daughter, Tanu Kumari, was married with Rahul Jha on 18.02.2024 as per Hindu rites. It is further alleged that at the time of marriage, Rs. 2,50,000/- was given; however, the accused persons used to misbehave with his daughter and were demanding a car and Rs. 2,50,000/-. They also used to intimidate her, stating that if the demand was not fulfilled, the informant's daughter would be killed. It is further alleged that on 12.11.2024 at around 10 PM, the accused persons killed the informant's daughter. The informant further states that prior to this, on 09.11.2024, the husband of the deceased, Rahul Jha, had taken the informant's daughter with him, though she was not willing to go with him. It is alleged that accused Rahul Jha, after making a plan to kill the deceased, left the village while his family members killed the informant's daughter.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in



the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner, namely Rahul Jha, in Cr. Misc. No. 33036 of 2025, is the husband of the deceased. It is further submitted that there is no eyewitness to the alleged occurrence. During the course of investigation, certain materials have been collected by the Investigating Officer (I.O.) suggesting that petitioner Rahul Jha, was not present at the place of occurrence at the relevant time. It is further submitted that, specifically in paragraph 30 of the case diary, the Call Detail Records (C.D.R.) of the petitioner, namely Rahul Jha, have been annexed, which reveal that he was in Ranchi at the time of the alleged occurrence. It is further submitted that, in paragraphs 64 and 65 of the case diary, several witnesses have stated that the husband of the deceased was not present at the place of occurrence at the time of the incident. The husband and father-in-law of the deceased are priests (*pujaris*), and her husband had gone to Ranchi in that capacity. It is further submitted that paragraphs 64, 65, and 67 of the case diary reveal that the deceased died by suicide and her husband was not present at home on the date of the occurrence.

6. So far as the petitioners in Cr. Misc. No. 33509 of 2025 are concerned, it is submitted that petitioner nos. 1 and 2 are the mother-in-law and father-in-law of the deceased,



respectively. The allegations levelled against the petitioners are entirely false and fabricated. The petitioners have been implicated in this case merely on the basis of suspicion. Both are persons of advanced age and have no criminal antecedents. They have been in custody since 24.11.2024. Similarly, petitioner Rahul Jha in Cr. Misc. No. 33036 of 2025 has also been in custody since 30.11.2024 having no criminal antecedents.

7. Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail.

8. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, let the petitioners in both the cases be released on bail upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M. II Biraul, Darbhanga, in connection with Ghanshyampur P.S. Case No. 333 of 2024, GR No. 1184 of 2024.

9. The applications stand allowed.

(Khatim Reza, J)

shyambihari/-

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

