

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80754 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-123 Year-2025 Thana- TETERHAT District- Lakhisarai

1. Usha Devi Wife of Kailu Yadav Resident of Village - Jhinaura, P.S.- Tetarhat, District - Lakhisarai.
2. Sita Devi Wife of Sabal Ray Resident of Village - Dundual Patel Nagar, Near Shiv Mandir, P.S.- Bhurkunda, District - Ramgarh (Jharkhand).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mayank Bilochan, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mritunjay Kumar Nirala, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 04-12-2025 Heard learned Advocate for the petitioners and
learned Advocate for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Tetarhat P.S. Case No.123 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109(1), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Based upon the written report, the prosecution alleges that while the informant went to the matrimonial home of his wife to get her *Bidai*, the accused persons, including the petitioners got infuriated and brutally assaulted him, which resulted into serious injury.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioners contended that



the petitioners are none else but the mother-in-law and sister-in-law of the informant, respectively and in fact on account of some matrimonial dispute between the husband and wife, the present FIR came to be instituted in order to wreck vengeance and put pressure upon all the family members of the wife. Moreover, the alleged occurrence took place on 15.06.2025 but the present FIR came to be instituted on 19.06.2025, without any proper explanation for delay. Referring to the injury report, it is further submitted that the opinion of the injury is reserved only because of the fact that the injured refused to undergo CT Scan of the brain. He further submitted that be that as it may, the petitioners are women having fair antecedent and they undertake that they will fully cooperate in the investigation of the Court.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State vehemently opposed the bail application.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Advocate for the respective parties and considering the nature of the dispute, coupled with the relationship as also the fact that the petitioners are women having fair antecedent, let the above named petitioners, be released on bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail



bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned C.J.M., Lakhisarai in connection with Tetarhat P.S. Case No.123 of 2025, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, with further condition that one of the bailors shall be the own/close family members of the petitioners.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

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

