

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58540 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-129 Year-2025 Thana- SOHSARAI District- Nalanda

Nilam Devi W/O Subhash Kumar @ Subhash Mahto Resident of village-
Murtujiganj, Post office- Mehandiganj, Police Station-Patna City, District-
Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ravi Ranjan Kumar S/O Arjun Mahto R/O Noon ka chauraha, Shisha Ka
Sipal, P.S.- Khajekala, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Aklavya Chandan Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Jay Ram Prasad, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 07-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP

for the State as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of

the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 90, 103
and 3(5) of B.N.S., 2023.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean
antecedent and is a woman and the informant, Ravi Ranjan
alleges that his sister was married to Ravi Kumar on
01.12.2021, further, the accused persons including the petitioner
on 10.03.2025, on pretext of a tour took his sister to Nalanda



where the accused persons killed her at the house of Rekha Devi, on receiving information, the informant came to the matrimonial house of his sister where he saw the dead body of his sister lying in an ambulance and the accused persons fled when the police was informed. Further, Ravi was in an illicit relationship with Monika Mehta which was objected by the deceased, it is next alleged that his sister was pregnant at the time of death and had a child out of the wedlock aged about two years.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case being mother-in-law of the deceased by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation, as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that his sister was married to Ravi Kumar who was in an illicit relationship with Monika Mehta and the relationship was being objected by the deceased, as such, the accused persons including the petitioner in connivance brought the deceased to Nalanda in the house of Rekha Devi where she was killed. It is submitted that Rekha Devi is the maternal aunt of the husband of the deceased. It is submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that as to why Rekha Devi would have allowed the accused persons



including the petitioner to kill the deceased in her house at Nalanda. It is next submitted that the allegation, as alleged, does not inspire confidence. It is also submitted that had the accused persons in connivance would have taken the deceased to Nalanda for killing her then definitely they would not have brought the deceased back to her matrimonial home for performing the last rites. It is also submitted that if the accused persons including the petitioner would have been involved in the occurrence then effort would have been made not to send the dead body for post mortem as the cause of death would have been ascertained but then the dead body was sent for post mortem which amply demonstrates that no effort whatsoever was made by the accused persons including the petitioner to conceal any kind of evidence. It is submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that on what basis it is being alleged by the informant that the accused persons including the petitioner killed the deceased in conspiracy after bringing her to Nalanda in the house of Rekha Devi when he is not an eye witness to the occurrence. It is also submitted that the date of occurrence is 10.03.2025 and the FIR itself records that police was informed about the occurrence when the accused fled away but then the FIR came to be instituted on 19.05.2025, i.e., after a delay of



more than two months.

5. The learned APP and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant oppose the anticipatory bail application. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that the date of occurrence is 10.03.2025 and on the said date itself the informant had informed the police and the police also came at the place of occurrence and thereafter the dead body was sent for post mortem but then the police for the reasons best known did not institute an FIR which necessitated filing of Cr.W.J.C. No.596 of 2025 in March, 2025. It is submitted that it was during pendency of Cr.W.J.C. No.596 of 2025 that the instant FIR came to be instituted, as such, from the side of the informant, there was no delay on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the police despite being aware of the occurrence did not institute an FIR though sent the body for post mortem amply demonstrates that the police was also convinced that it was not a case of murder or else the police would have promptly instituted an FIR.

6. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, let 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 bond 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 Sohsarai P.S. Case No.129 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sanjay/-

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

