

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42788 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-183 Year-2019 Thana- MAKHDUMPUR District- Jehanabad

Punam Kumari @ Punam Devi W/o Late Dipak Kumar Resident of Village-
Chapri Tola, Panda Bigha Raniganj, P.S.- Imamganj, District-Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Meena Devi W/o Jwala Rai R/o Village- Bari Beknari, P.S.-Makhdumpur,
District- Jehanabad

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kanishk Kaustubh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bharat Bhushan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 09-07-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection
with Makhdumpur P.S. Case No. 183 of 2019 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 306 and 120B of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner, being wife, has been falsely implicated in the
instant case by the informant, who is her mother-in-law. It is
next submitted that the informant alleges that her son (deceased)
was married to the petitioner ten years back and the marriage
was a love marriage and out of the wedlock, two children were
born, but after some time, some dispute arose in between the
deceased and the petitioner, on account of which the petitioner



left her matrimonial home along with the children and came back to her parental home. It is further alleged that efforts were made for reconciliation, but the same failed and the petitioner never allowed the deceased to meet the children on account of which the deceased used to remain perturbed. It is also alleged that whenever the deceased used to go to the parental home of the petitioner for meeting the children, he was assaulted by her family members. It is next alleged that the petitioner even threatened the deceased not to come to her parental home or else he would be killed. It is further alleged that the deceased remained disturbed since he was not allowed to meet his children, as such he consumed poison and died during the course of treatment.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the marriage of the deceased with the petitioner was a love marriage and on account of dispute, the petitioner had separated from the deceased and was living at her parental home for the last four years, as such it cannot be alleged that it was on account of the petitioner that the son of the informant committed suicide by



consuming poison.

5. The learned APP vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that no doubt the petitioner and the deceased were living separately on account of dispute, but then the children, born out of the wedlock, were with the petitioner; and the petitioner and her family members did not allow the deceased to meet the children, as such he became frustrated based on the condition created by the petitioner and her family members, which left the deceased with no option but to take the extreme step of ending his life.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner as from the allegation it can be culled out that though the petitioner and the deceased were living separately, but then the petitioner created conditions conducive for the deceased to take extreme step of ending his life.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

