

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67833 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-77 Year-2025 Thana- SURYAPURA District- Rohtas

- 1. Jyoti Kumari D/O Sudama Giri R/O Vill.- Bahuara Matihiya, P.S.- Suruapura, Dist.- Rohtas at Sasaram
- 2. Birendra Giri S/O Tarkeshwar Giri R/O Vill.- Bahuara Matihiya, P.S.- Suruapura, Dist.- Rohtas at Sasaram
- 3. Tarkeshwar Giri R/O Vill.- Bahuara Matihiya, P.S.- Suruapura, Dist.- Rohtas at Sasaram

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

with
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 68101 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-77 Year-2025 Thana- SURYAPURA District- Rohtas

- 1. Sunil Giri @ Sunil Goshwami S/O Vakeel Gaushwami R/O Village- Tiyar, P.S.- Tiyar, District- Bhojpur
- 2. Aarti Devi W/O Sunil Giri @ Sunil Goshwami R/O Village- Tiyar, P.S.- Tiyar, District- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 67833 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Priya
Mr. Prabhat Kumar Singh
Mr. Phool Jahan
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar- A.P.P.
Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh
Mr. Rohit Kumar Singh
Mrs. Sweta Suman
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 68101 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Priya
Mr. Kameshwar Singh
Mr. Phool Jahan
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary- A.P.P.
Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh
Mr. Rohit Kumar Singh
Mrs. Sweta Suman



CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 02-12-2025 **CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67833 of 2025**

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80, 238, 61(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his daughter was married to Ranjan Giri in the Year 2023. Further, after marriage, the accused persons were demanding a motorcycle and a gold chain and on account of non-fulfillment of the dowry demand, the victim was tortured mentally and physically. Further, on 15.03.2025 on the eve of Holi, the victim called the informant and disclosed that her husband, mother in-law, father in-law and sister in-law are planning to kill her and on 16.03.2025, he received an information that his daughter has been killed and for concealing the evidence, the body has been disposed of.

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 informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence and the allegation of demand of dowry and torture is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that petitioner no.1 is married sister in-law of the deceased and petitioner nos.2 and 3 are not directly related to the husband of the deceased, but then, are relatives. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the thrust of the allegation is against the husband, father in-law and mother in-law and to an extent against the sister in-law, but then, the married sister in-law has been implicated only with a view to coerce the entire family members into submission. It is also submitted that the informant does not specifically allege that petitioner nos.2 and 3 were involved in the occurrence, but then, alleges that he came to know that they helped the accused in disposing the dead body. It is submitted that even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting against the petitioner nos.2 and 3, in that event, they are not alleged to have killed the deceased rather are alleged to have helped the accused in disposing of the dead body, which is a bailable offence. It is also submitted that petitioner no.1 is married sister-in-law of the deceased and resides separately and has her own husband, children and



household to look after. It is also submitted that husband of the deceased is in custody and the father in-law and mother in-law have already withdrawn their anticipatory bail application before this Court.

5. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant 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 Trial Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Suryapura P. S. Case No.77 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

7. The application stands allowed.

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 68101 of 2025

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.



2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80, 238, 61(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his daughter was married to Ranjan Giri in the Year 2023. Further, after marriage, the accused persons were demanding a motorcycle and a gold chain and on account of non-fulfillment of the dowry demand, the victim was tortured mentally and physically. Further, on 15.03.2025 on the eve of Holi, the victim called the informant and disclosed that her husband, mother in-law, father in-law and sister in-law are planning to kill her and on 16.03.2025, he received an information that his daughter has been killed and for concealing the evidence, the body has been disposed of.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are not related to the husband of the deceased rather had mediated the marriage, as such, they also came to be implicated with general and omnibus allegation that they instigated the family members of the husband of the deceased against the victim. It is further submitted that petitioner no.1 works as a Security Guard at Delhi and on the date of



occurrence, he was not even present at the village and petitioner no.2 being wife of petitioner no.1 also came to be implicated with general and omnibus allegation.

5. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant 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 Trial Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Suryapura P. S. Case No.77 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

