

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88915 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-151 Year-2024 Thana- RAMPUR HARI District- Muzaffarpur

Cheti Devi @ Chaiti Devi W/o- Late Raj Kumar Das Village- Brahanda PS-  
Rampur Hari District-Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ravi Ranjan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Pushpa Sinha, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      14-05-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with  
Rampur Hari P.S. Case No. 151/2024 registered for the  
offences under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya  
Sanhita

3. The prosecution case in nutshell is that the son  
of the informant namely Raj Kumar was killed by the  
daughter-in-law (petitioner), grand son and great grandson  
of the informant on the night of 09.08.2024 and thereafter,  
they all fled away.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
the petitioner is the wife of the deceased-Raj Kumar and



she has falsely been implicated in this case at the behest of her mother-in-law with whom she had personal dispute. Learned counsel further submits that during the course of investigation there is no material to suggest the complicity of the petitioner in the alleged incident. From perusal of the case diary, it is evident that the police has not investigated to verify the mode, weapon or otherwise which was used to strangle the deceased. Learned counsel further submits that the arrest of the petitioner also creates doubt as it has not been stated by the police during investigation that from which place the petitioner was apprehended, though the petitioner has claimed that she was out of village when the incident took place and she returned after hearing about the death of her husband. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent and she is languishing in custody since 12.08.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is the wife of the deceased and she along with other accused persons had killed the son of the informant.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and



circumstances of the case and taking into account that there is no concrete evidence as of now to prove the complicity of the petitioner in the present case and there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner along with her son and daughter-in-law, let the petitioner above-named be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate 9<sup>th</sup> (East) Muzaffarpur in connection with Rampur Hari P.S. Case No. 151/2024 subject to the conditions :-

- a. One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be her close relative.
- b. The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.
- c. In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the court concerned.
- d. The Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at



any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed her criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the afore-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

tusharika/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

