

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53455 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2025 Thana- TETERHAT District- Lakhisarai

Sarita Devi W/O Ramashish Yadav @ Tasru Yadav R/O Village- Jhinoura,  
PS- Tetarhat, District- Lakhisarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Singh

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

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      19-08-2025              1.    Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned A.P.P. for the State, Shri Rabindra Kumar.

2.    The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection  
with Tetarhat Police Station Case No. 19 of 2025 registered for  
the offences punishable under Sections 80, 238, 3(5) of the  
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3.    Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant  
alleges that his daughter was married to Rahul in the year 2024,  
further after marriage the accused persons were demanding  
dowry and on account of non-fulfillment of the same, it is  
alleged that the daughter of the informant was killed.

4.    The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case being



mother-in-law of the deceased. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant himself alleges that it was his son-in-law, who informed on 2-2-2025 that his daughter is not well, as such, it is submitted that had the petitioner and her family members committed the occurrence, in that event, the son-in-law would not have informed the informant about the condition of his daughter.

5. The learned APP opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that the marriage of the daughter of the informant with Rahul was solemnized in the year 2024 and the death took place at the matrimonial home in the year 2025, as such, in law even presumption is against the accused persons. It is further submitted that had the petitioner and her family members not involved in the occurrence, in that event, the dead body would have been sent for post-mortem for ascertaining the cause of death, but the same was not done, rather the body was cremated with an intention to conceal evidence. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned



APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

