

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40660 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-105 Year-2025 Thana- AMARPUR District- Banka

Manju Devi @ Manju Kumari W/O Deepak Kumar Das @ Deepak Das
Resident of Village- Domodih, P.O.- Kumarpur, P.S.- Kumarpur, District-
Banka

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ved Prakash Chandan, Advocate

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

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

ORAL ORDER

2 27-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection
with Amarpur (Fullidumar) P.S. Case No. 105 of 2025,
instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 80(2) and
3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, due to non-
fulfillment of demand of dowry, daughter of the informant was
done to death by her in-laws.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the
present case. No incriminating material has been recovered from
the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for



the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is married sister-in-law of the deceased and she was living with her husband. The petitioner is separate in mess and business from the husband of the deceased. It is further submitted that the allegation levelled against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. No specific allegation has been attributed against the petitioner. It is next submitted that husband of the deceased is in judicial custody. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. Other co-accused has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 13-05-2025, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 30534 of 2024.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is contended that petitioner is named in the FIR and there is specific allegation levelled against her, which is evident from perusal of the FIR itself, hence, she does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, taking into account the fact that petitioner is named in the FIR and there is specific allegation attributed to her, hence, this Court is not inclined to grant her anticipatory bail. Prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is, accordingly, ***rejected***.



7. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the court below within a period of four weeks from today and prays for regular bail, the same would be considered by the court below in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

