

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49102 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-128 Year-2024 Thana- SIMRI District- Darbhanga

=====

Vimla Devi Wife of Raj Kumar Sahni R/O- Kanshi, P.S.- Simri, District-
Darbhanga, Bihar- 847428

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Padmanabh Kashyap, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rana Randhir Singh, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 18-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
Simri P.S. Case No. 128 of 2024, registered under Sections
302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, the
accusation against the accused persons including the petitioner
is of demanding dowry from the informant and her father and,
on non-fulfillment of the same, they abused and assaulted the
informant's father by fists, slaps and *lathi* due to which the
informant's father died in course of his treatment. It is further
alleged that the petitioner along with other co-accused person
clogged the mouth of the informant with a cloth.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is a lady and she has no specific role in committing murder of informant's father. The only allegation levelled against the petitioner is that she along with other co-accused person have clogged the mouth of the informant with a cloth and for which there has been no injury on the person of the informant. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that similarly situated co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 24.03.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 89492 of 2024.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and submits that during investigation witnesses have supported the allegation levelled against the accused petitioner. There is specific allegation against the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



7. The prayer is rejected. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender in the Court below and pray for regular bail. If any such application is filed, the Court below shall consider and dispose of the same on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

