

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.83810 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-15 Year-2024 Thana- GURUA District- Gaya

1. Munni Kumari D/O-Raju Thakur, Wife of Sushil Thakur Resident of Village- Manpur, Gandhi Nagar, P.S. -Muffasil, District- Gaya,
2. Roshan Thakur @ Raushan Thakur @ Roshan Kumar Son of Raju Thakur Resident of Village- Manpur, Gandhi Nagar, P.S.- Muffasil, Distt.- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Gajendra Kumar Singh, Adv

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

5 13-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, and the learned APP for the State.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners makes a prayer for withdrawing the application of petitioner no. 2 Roshan Thakur and the same is allowed and if he surrenders and prays for regular bail, the same shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by the present withdrawal and it would also be taken into consideration that other accused persons have been granted the privilege of regular bail.

3. The petitioner no1, Munni Kumari, apprehends her arrest in connection with Gurua P.S.Case No. 15 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304B/34



of the Indian Penal Code.

4. Vide an earlier order dated 3.04.2025, an explanation had been sought from S.S.P, Gaya with regard to delayed lodging of the FIR of the present case. The explanation has been provided by the senior S.S. P, Gaya and the same is kept on record.

5. The FIR, discloses that the daughter of the informant stayed for ten months in her *sasural* where she was tortured on account of non fulfillment of dowry. Thereafter, she was ousted from there. It is further alleged that the daughter was being threatened on phone by the husband that he would solemnize a second marriage and had put her number in block list. On account of such mental torture, the daughter of the informant went out of the house and poured kerosene upon herself in order to end her life.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that so far as the petitioner no. 1 is concerned, she happens to be married sister-in-law of the deceased and there is no specific allegation upon her in the FIR. The allegations are specific to the extent of the husband and it is basically the husband, who is primarily responsible for the welfare of his wife.

7. Learned APP for the State opposes the anticipatory



bail.

8. Taking into consideration that the petitioner no. 1 is a married sister-in-law, who stayed separately and had no connection with the day to day affairs of the deceased and her husband, I am inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, in the event of her arrest/ surrender within a period of four weeks from today the petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st, Sherghati, Gaya in Gurua P.S. Case No.15 of 2024, subject to condition as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C and subject to the further condition that the petitioners shall co-operate in investigation/ trial.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

N.K/-

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

