

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63738 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-66 Year-2025 Thana- HILSA District- Nalanda

=====

Pramila Devi wife of Umesh Paswan Resident Of Village -Mai, Ps- Hilsa,
Dist -Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vibhuti Ranjan Sonvadra, Adv.
For the State : Mrs.Gulnar Begum, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 19-09-2025 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), 3(5) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and sections 3/4 of Dowry
Prohibition Act, 1961.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman and
the informant alleges that his daughter was married to the son of
the informant in July, 2024, after marriage, the petitioner and
other co-accused persons started torturing his daughter for non-
fulfillment of the demand of dowry of a motorcycle. Further, on
30.01.2025, the informant received an information that his
daughter was admitted at Hilsa Hospital, accordingly, he



reached the hospital but found her dead.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner being the mother-in-law has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R., it would manifest that allegation of demand of dowry and torture is general and omnibus in nature. It is also submitted that no doubt the death of the daughter of the informant took place within seven years of marriage, as such, in law there is a presumption against the husband and family members but then all deaths are not dowry deaths. It is also submitted that informant is not an eye-witness to the occurrence and from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R., it would manifest that informant was informed that his daughter was admitted at Hilsa Hospital where he came and found her dead. It is next submitted that had the petitioner been involved in the occurrence along with her family members, efforts would have been made to dispose off the dead body with a view to conceal evidence but then the victim was taken to hospital where she died and thereafter postmortem was conducted, it is also submitted that had the petitioner been involved along with her family members, in that event, efforts would have been made not to have the postmortem of the



dead body as the cause of death would be ascertained but then no such effort was made. It is also submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove her innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the submissions made on behalf of 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 Hilsa P.S. Case No. 66 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

pallavi/-

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

