

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72876 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-73 Year-2025 Thana- VIDYAPATINAGAR District- Samastipur

1. Dharamveer Sahni @ Dharamveer Kumar Baijnath Sahni @ Baijanath Sahni R/o Village - Sothgama, Police Station -Vidyapatinagar, District - Samastipur.
2. Dhirja Devi @ Sirja Devi Wife of Baijnath Sahni @ Baijanath Sahni R/o Village - Sothgama, Police Station -Vidyapatinagar, District - Samastipur.
3. Baijnath Sahni @ Baijanath Sahni Son of Late Gaya Sahni R/o Village - Sothgama, Police Station -Vidyapatinagar, District - Samastipur.
4. Jagmaya Devi D/o Baijnath Sahni @ Baijanath Sahni R/o Village - Sothgama, Police Station -Vidyapatinagar, District - Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mahendra Pratap

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 11-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Vidyapatinagar PS Case No. 73 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. The SHO and the Investigating Officer of the case, in compliance of the order dated 19-11-2025, are present in the Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the



petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and petitioner nos. 2, 4 are woman and the informant alleges that some people from the house of the in-laws of his son came on 11-5-2025 and took his son and daughter-in-law on a motorcycle to their village, further on 14-5-2025 at 6 am, they disclosed that his son hanged himself, further Dharamveer, Shukla Sahani, Baijnath and Dheerja Devi had taken his son and daughter-in-law to their village, next alleges that all the accused persons killed his son, further alleges on 13-5-2025 he had gone to meet his son, but they did not allow him to meet.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant based on suspicion. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant is not an eye-witness to the occurrence. It is further submitted that informant alleges that on 11-5-2025, Dharamveer, Shukla Sahani, Baijnath and Dheerja Devi had come and taken his son and daughter-in-law along with themselves. It is next submitted that had the informant any inkling that some untoward occurrence may take place with his son, in that event, he would not have permitted his son to accompany the accused persons. It is further submitted that no



doubt during the course of investigation, it has come that relationship of the deceased with his wife was not congenial, but then that in itself is not a ground for presuming that the accused persons killed the son of the informant. It is also submitted that it is difficult to comprehend that the in-laws of the deceased would have killed him, thus making their daughter a widow.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted as per allegation is that the deceased was taken to the village of his wife by the named accused persons on 11-5-2025 and the accused persons informed the informant on 14-5-2025 that the deceased had committed suicide by hanging and the dead body was lying in the house of the accused, it is also submitted that the postmortem report does not certify that the death was on account of hanging rather records that one ante-mortem injury on finger was seen, it is further submitted that the viscera was sent to FSL, but then from perusal of the FSL report, it would manifest that no poison was found nor the death has been opined to be a normal death. The learned APP thus submits that from the postmortem report, it cannot be culled out that the death was on account of asphyxia due to hanging, it is also submitted that investigation in the case



is continuing as such it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

7. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is rejected.

9. The personal appearance of the SHO and the Investigating Officer of the case is dispensed with.

10. The office is directed to return the FSL report to the learned trial court.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

