

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78557 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-390 Year-2024 Thana- MUFFASIL District- West Champaran

1. Sunita Devi W/O Sunil Raut @ Sunil Prasad Resident of Village- Barwat Pasrain, P.S- Bettiah Muffasil, Distt.- West Champaran.
2. Vivek Kumar @ Vivek Prasad S/O Sunil Raut @ Sunil Prasad Resident of Village- Barwat Pasrain, P.S- Bettiah Muffasil, Distt.- West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dharmesh Kumar Chaubey, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dr. Indihar Kumari, Adv

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND
MALVIYA**

ORAL ORDER

3 22-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehends their arrest in connection with Bettiah (M) P.S Case No. 390 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80(2), 238(a), 3(5) of BNS, 2023

3. As per allegation in the FIR, petitioners along with the other co-accused has killed the informant's daughter whose marriage was solemnized on 26.02.2018 along with Ravi Prasad.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He next



submits that petitioner no. 1 is the mother-in-law and the petitioner no. 2 is the brother-in-law (Dewar). He next submits that just after 2-3 years of marriage, deceased and her husband started living separately with his family members. He next submits that the death of the deceased has been occurred in suspicious manner after seven years of marriage.

5. However, learned APP for the State oppose the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for the informant has vehemently opposes that prayer for bail and submits that petitioner along with the other co-accused has killed the informant's daughter and cremated her body without informing family members of the victim. He further produces one document in which it seems that processes under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. has been initiated and warrant has already been issued against the petitioners

7. On perusal of the FIR, impugned order dated 01.10.2024 and the entire case diary, it appears that in Paragraph 11, 12, 33 and 34 several witnesses has supported the prosecution witness and also considering the nature of allegation leveled against the petitioner the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and submissions made on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is not inclined



to grant bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the
petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

