

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40274 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-233 Year-2024 Thana- DANIYAWAN District- Patna

1. Ramashray Paswan S/O Late Ramsharan Das R/O Vill.- Madwa, P.s.- Daniyawan, Dist.- Patna.
2. Mitranjan @ Chitranjan Kumar S/o Ramashray Paswan R/O Vill.- Madwa, P.s.- Daniyawan, Dist.- Patna.
3. Ram Vilash Paswan @Ram Vilash Kumar S/o Ramashray Paswan R/O Vill.- Madwa, P.s.- Daniyawan, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Tilak Sao
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA

ORAL ORDER

- 2 16-07-2025
1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.
 2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out of Daniyawan Police Station Case No. 233 of 2024, disclosing offences under Sections 103(1), 238, 61, 3(5) of the BNS, 2023.
 3. As per the prosecution case, the informant lodged an F.I.R. on 12.11.2024 alleging that his daughter Pallavi Bharati @ Nigam, who had married the accused Babuchandra Paswan @ Alok in 2022, was killed and her body was concealed



by the accused persons. The informant stated that his other daughter namely Ananya Bharati had earlier married the same accused in 2019. On 11.11.2024, informant received information from villagers about Pallavi's death and, upon visiting the accused's house, found them absconding, which raised suspicion, leading to the registration of the present case.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in the present case due to suspicion. He next submits that there is no legal and cogent evidence against the petitioners to connect them with the present case. Nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioners. Petitioner No. 1 is father-in-law and petitioner nos. 2 and 3 are brother-in-law (Devar) of the deceased and they are living separately from the husband of the deceased and they have not committed any overt act against the deceased. There is no eye-witness to support the case of the prosecution. The husband of the deceased is already in custody. He further submits that the deceased has died due to suicide committed by herself by hanging through the ceiling.

5. Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the nature of offence and the severity of punishment, I am not



inclined to grant the petitioners privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

