

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37864 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-205 Year-2025 Thana- GAYA MUFASIL District- Gaya

Rupa Devi @ Rupa Kumari @ Rupa Devi Kumari, Female, aged about 23 years, W/O Deepak Yadav @ Deepak Kumar, R/O Vill.- Kathautiya, P.S.- Gaya Mufasil, Dist.- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : M/S. Manish Kumar and Aryan Singh, Advocates
For the Opposite Party : Mrs. Nirmala Kumari, A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

3 19-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P for the State.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Gaya Muffasil P.S. Case No. 205 of 2025 dated 04.03.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section 103(1) read with Section 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 04.03.2025 at about 14.00 hours, the informant's daughter Sunita Devi was married to Ramjanam Yadav and after marriage, she had two daughters and one son, namely, Deepak Kumar and Deepak Kumar was married with Rupa Devi (petitioner) but her character was not good. She had illicit relationship with other



co-accused person, namely, Pappu Yadav and whenever Sunita Devi raised objection then Rupa Devi (petitioner) had assaulted Sunita Devi and had also ousted her from the house. The informant's son-in-law and maternal grand-son both had gone outside the State for earning their livelihood and in their absence, Rupa Devi (petitioner) had illicit relationship with the other co-accused Pappu Yadav. It is further alleged that Rupa Devi (petitioner) and the other co-accused Pappu Yadav have killed the informant's daughter Sunita Devi at midnight of 03.03.2025 and 04.03.2025. The informant was informed about the incident on 04.03.2025 then he went to the house of Sunita Devi and found her dead body there.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case due to family dispute. The petitioner is the wife of the maternal grand-son of the informant and therefore, she has not committed any offence. It is further submitted that the real fact is that the petitioner came after marriage and started residing at her Sasural and her husband and his family members regularly tortured for illegal demands and for which she used to protest. It is further submitted that the deceased died due to falling from the roof, the informant and her sister-in-law (Nanad) had made a



concocted story that the petitioner assaulted the deceased who happens to be the mother-in-law of the petitioner, due to which, she died. The allegation of illicit relationship with the other co-accused Pappu Yadav is also false and baseless and only to implicate the petitioner, this story has been cooked up by the informant. The doctor has conducted the postmortem of the deceased and found some injuries but all the injuries was caused due to fall from the roof. It is further submitted that in the present case, affidavit has been sworn by the husband of the petitioner which also shows that the petitioner has been made accused in the present case due to some confusion. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged offence. There is no eye witness to the alleged offence. Learned counsel for the petitioner has produced the certified copy of the depositions of the informant (P.W. 3) and the husband of the petitioner (P.W.4) in the Court, let it be kept on the record, in which they have stated that the petitioner is innocent and due to some misunderstanding the petitioner has been made accused in the present case. The petitioner has clean antecedent as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is in custody since 05.03.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently



opposed the bail petition of the petitioner and has further submitted that the petitioner is named in the F.I.R. Learned A.P.P. for the State has further submitted that during the course of investigation, the witnesses have stated that the petitioner had illicit relationship with the other co-accused Pappu Yadav and whenever the deceased used to object about it, the petitioner used to assault her and would throw her outside the house. It is further submitted that from paragraph no. 48 of the case diary, it appears that the deceased had sustained ante-mortem injuries on her body which was caused by hard and blunt substance and cause of death was haemorrhage and shock.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the accusation made against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the same is rejected in connection with Gaya Muffasil P.S. Case No. 205 of 2025, pending in the court of learned C.J.M. Gaya.

7. The application stands rejected.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

U.K./-

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

