

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58956 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2025 Thana- EKANGARSARAI District- Nalanda

Manju Devi @ Gayatri Devi W/o Sri Sikandar Prasad R/o Village- Manpur,
P.O.- Dhangawan, P.S.- Ekangarsarai, Distt.- Nalanda (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ran Vijay Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Akshay Lal Pandit

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 10-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80(2) of
the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is mother-in-law
of the deceased. It is next submitted that informant alleges that
his maternal-niece was married to Bipin Kumar about four years
ago, on 10-3-2025 he received an information that his niece was
brutally murdered, accordingly the informant reached the place
of occurrence and saw that dead body was kept on an *auto* with
an intention to dispose of the same, but the *auto* was stopped by
Gaurav and his friends; and the accused fled, further the dead



body was sent for post-mortem. It is next alleged that accused persons used to torture the victim alleging that she cannot give birth to a child.

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 the informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence. It is also submitted that the marriage was four years old and in between these four years, no case ever came to be instituted either by the deceased or the informant alleging torture. It is next submitted that the victim was being treated by doctors for curing her infertility, but the same was not cured, on account of which the victim started remaining depressed. It is further submitted that since the victim was not able to bear a child, as such she committed suicide, as has been pleaded at Para-11 of the anticipatory bail application. It is also submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that no allegation of demand of dowry is alleged nor the informant discloses who informed him about the death of the victim. It is next submitted that after the victim committed suicide, an *auto* was called for taking the body to a hospital for post-mortem, but by then the informant along with others came and the instant FIR came to be



instituted. It is submitted that had the petitioner been involved in the occurrence, in that event efforts would have been made by the family to dispose of the dead body with a view to conceal evidence. It is reiterated and submitted that since the victim, even after four years of marriage, was not able to conceive, as such she committed suicide. It is next submitted that no doubt the death occurred within seven years of marriage, but then all deaths are not dowry deaths. It is also submitted that the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove her innocence. It is next submitted that the husband of the deceased is in custody.

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

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Ekangarsarai P.S. Case No. 55 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down



under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

