

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36740 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-381 Year-2024 Thana- BEGUSARAI MUFFASIL District-
Begusarai

Jagtaran Devi @ Sita Devi W/O Late Gandhuli Choudhary R/O Vill.-
Jinedpur, Ward no. 4, P.s.- Mufasil, Dist.- Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 41456 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-381 Year-2024 Thana- BEGUSARAI MUFFASIL District-
Begusarai

Kundan Chaudhary S/O Late Gandholi Chaudhary @ Gandori Chaudhary
Resident of Village- Jinedpur, Ward No 04, PS- Muffasil, Distt-Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Daulti Devi W/O Late Jivan Sah Resident of Village- Jinedpur, Ward No 1,
PS- Muffasil, Distt-Begusarai

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 36740 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Thakur
Ms. Vaishnavi Singh
Mr. Ritwik Thakur
Mr. Purushottam Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Madhuri Lata

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 41456 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vinod Gautam

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ramesh Chandra

For the Informant Mr. S.K. Gautam

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

3 25-11-2025

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest for the



offences alleged under Sections 103(1), 61(2), 351(2) of the BNS, registered in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 381 of 2024.

3. The informant alleges that her husband, who worked at the petitioner Jagataran Devi's house, was called back on 01.11.2024, given poisonous food by the accused persons and later he was found dead near Hanuman Temple. The informant suspects the involvement of the petitioners and others in the said occurrence.

4. The learned counsels for the petitioners have submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated. No motive has been assigned for killing of the deceased against the petitioners. Admittedly, he was serving the cattle of the petitioners. During his lifetime the deceased had never complained against the petitioners. The occurrence took place on 01.11.2024, but the FIR was lodged on 02.11.2024.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners by submitting that exactly on similar ground co-accused persons have been granted regular bail by a coordinate Bench of this Court in Cr.Misc.No. 36747 of 2025, whereas these are anticipatory bail applications.



6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to exercise its discretion in favour of the petitioners.

7. However, if the petitioners surrender before the court below and make prayer for regular bail, the same shall be disposed of on the same day. I do not see any reason why the same benefit should not be granted to the petitioners as granted to the co-accused by a coordinate Bench of this Court in Cr.Misc.No. 36747 of 2025, as the case of present petitioners is exactly on identical footing.

8. With the direction/observation aforesaid, the applications stand disposed of.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

