

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46777 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-185 Year-2023 Thana- DUMRA District- Sitamarhi

Gena Devi @ Ram Pukari Devi W/O Harinarayan Rai R/O Village- Bhaluaha,
P.S- Dumra, Distt.- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Uday Kumar, Adv.

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

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 11-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection with Dumra P.S. Case No. 185 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302/304B/201/34 of the Indian Penal Code..

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against four named accused persons including the present petitioner against whom there is allegation of dowry death.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged in the F.I.R. Learned counsel submits that petitioner is the mother-in-law and she is residing separately with her son and



daughter-in-law. She has no concerned with the family of the deceased daughter-in-law and her son. He submits that the only unfortunate part of the petitioner is that she is involved in two criminal cases under Section 304B of the Indian Penal Code itself. In one of such cases, she has been acquitted and in another case she is on bail. He further submits that anticipatory bail application of the son of the petitioner has been rejected. There is no specific or direct allegation of any overt act against the petitioner rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. There is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is ready to fulfill all the conditions whatsoever shall be imposed upon him.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged is serious in nature. The petitioner has two criminal antecedents of the similar nature of offence and, hence, she does not deserve privilege of anticipatory bail of this Court.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence as also there being two criminal antecedents of the similar nature of offence, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticiaptory bail to the petitioner.



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

8. If the petitioner surrenders before the court below within a period of six weeks from today and prays for regular bail, the same would be considered by the court below in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

