

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63932 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-5 Year-2025 Thana- SAHPUR District- Patna

1. Parvati Devi @ Patiya Devi @ Patia Devi, W/o Sanjay Rai @ Sanjay Ray R/o Village- Sabalpur, P.S.- Sonpur, District- Chhapra (Saran)
2. Sanjay Rai @ Sanjay Ray, S/o Asarfi Lal Rai R/o Village- Sabalpur, P.S.- Sonpur, District- Chhapra (Saran)
3. Punam Devi, W/o Shashi Rai R/o Harsam Chak, P.S.- Akilpur, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Patanjali Rishi
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 23-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.
2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80 and 3(5) of the B.N.S.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and petitioner nos.1 and 3 are women and the informant alleges that his daughter was married to Sunny on 24.04.2024. After marriage, her husband and father in-law started demanding a motorcycle on the ground that Bindeshwar Rai (father of Sunny) had given a motorcycle to his son in-law Sanjay. Further, on 05.01.2025, he was informed by



his relative that his daughter has been killed. Accordingly, he along with his son reached the place and saw the dead body of his daughter lying and accused persons had fled, thus alleges that his daughter was killed by the accused persons.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioner nos.1 and 3 are married sister in-law of the deceased and petitioner no.2 is husband of petitioner no.1. It is next submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence and from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that allegation of demand of dowry and torture is general and omnibus in nature. It is also submitted that the petitioner nos.1 and 3 after their marriage were residing at their matrimonial home. It is also submitted that whenever any dispute arises in between the husband and the wife and the occurrence of the nature as alleged takes place, the entire family members are implicated in a mechanical manner with general and omnibus allegation. It is next submitted that had the petitioners been involved in the occurrence, in that event, efforts would have been made to dispose of the dead body with a view to conceal evidence, but then, from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the dead body was lying at the place of occurrence and the same was sent



for post mortem also. It is next submitted that had the petitioners been involved in the occurrence, then efforts would have been made not to send the body for post mortem or else the cause of death would be ascertained. It is also submitted that petitioners will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove their innocence.

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

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, are directed to be released on anticipatory bail on their furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Danapur, Patna in connection with Shahpur P. S. Case No.05 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

