

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33678 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-583 Year-2024 Thana- RANIGANJ District- Araria

Dusiya Devi @ Dhusiya Kumari D/o Bindu Rishidev @ Bindi Rishidev Wife
of Kripali Rishidev, R/o Village- Shiv Nagar, Ward No. 12, Majhuwa West,
P.S.- Raniganj, District- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 45713 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-583 Year-2024 Thana- RANIGANJ District- Araria

Mohan Mehta S/o Late Jago Mehta R/o Village- Shiv Nagar Majhuwa West
Ward No. 12, P.S.- Raniganj, District- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 33678 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar Rana, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 45713 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar Rana, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 03-09-2025 Since both the applications arise out of Raniganj P.S.

Case No. 583 of 2024, as such, they have been taken up together

and are being disposed of by this common order.

02. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned APPs for the State.

03. In the present case, the petitioners seek bail in



connection with Raniganj P.S. Case No. 583 of 2024 registered for the alleged offences under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

04. As per prosecution case, the sister of the informant was strangled to death by the petitioners.

05. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. There is no eye witness to the alleged occurrence. Merely on the basis of suspicion, the present case has been lodged by the informant who is himself not an eye witness. The petitioner-Dusiya Devi is not the relative of the informant or the deceased and only suspicion has been raised that she has extra marital relationship with the petitioner-Mohan Mehta, husband of the deceased, due to which, both of them committed murder of sister of the informant by pressing her neck. The informant got registered the FIR on saying of his niece, Sinku Kumari, but from the statement of Sinku Kumari, it seems that she has not seen the occurrence through her own eyes. The petitioner-Dusiya Devi is a married women and she has no concern with the petitioner-Mohan Mehta. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner-Mohan Mehta was not even present at the time of occurrence in his house and his wife



committed suicide by hanging herself. The petitioner-Mohan Mehta has no relationship with petitioner-Dusiya Devi and allegation of illicit relationship is completely false and concocted. Learned counsel further submits that the marriage between the petitioner-Mohan Mehta and the deceased had been solemnized 25 years back and from this wedlock, they have five daughters and two sons and it is not believable that the petitioner-Mohan Mehta would take such an extreme step. The petitioner-Mohan Mehta is in custody since 30.12.2024 whereas petitioner-Dusiya Devi is in custody since 04.01.2025. Charge-sheet has been submitted. The petitioners are having clean antecedent.

06. Learned APPs for the State vehemently oppose the prayer for bail. Learned APPs submit that the witnesses examined during investigation have stated about the illicit relationship of the petitioners and the daughter of the petitioner-Mohan Mehta has stated about the petitioner-Mohan Mehta killing her mother with the help of petitioner-Dusiya Devi. Learned APPs further submit that a daughter would not falsely implicate her father. The postmortem report also shows death was due to asphyxia as a result of throttling. This shows that the deceased was throttled to death.



07. Having regard to the facts and circumstances and submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioners, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners. Hence, their prayer for bail is **rejected**.

08. The trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same at the earliest.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

Ashish/-

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

