

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3363 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-190 Year-2024 Thana- DIGHWARA District- Saran

1. Anand Mohan Singh, Son of Indramani Singh, Resident of Village- Ramdas Chak, PS -Dighwara, District -Saran.
2. Gita Devi, Wife of Indramani Singh, Resident of Village- Ramdas Chak, PS -Dighwara, District -Saran.
3. Anju Devi @ Anju Singh, Wife of Anand Mohan Singh, Resident of Village- Ramdas Chak, PS -Dighwara, District -Saran.
4. Krishna Mohan Singh @ Krishna Mohan @ Krishn Mohan Singh @ Krishn Mohan, son of Indramani Singh, Resident of Village- Ramdas Chak, PS -Dighwara, District -Saran.
5. Jagmohan Singh @ Jagmohan @ Jagmoham, son of Indramani Singh, Resident of Village- Ramdas Chak, PS -Dighwara, District -Saran.
6. Indramani Singh, Son of Late Sriram Singh, Resident of Village- Ramdas Chak, PS -Dighwara, District -Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Niranjana Parihar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 15-02-2025 Heard Mr. Niranjana Parihar, learned Advocate for the

petitioners and the learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Dighwara P.S. Case No. 190 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304(B), 328/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Based upon the written report, the informant alleges that the marriage of his sister was solemnized with Vishwa



Mohan Singh long back on 19.04.2018. However, she has always been subjected to demand of dowry and on account of non-fulfillment of the same she was done to death on 07.06.2024, after administering poison by all the accused persons.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioners contended that the petitioners are non-else, but the in-laws of the deceased. So far the husband of the deceased is concerned, he is not before this Court. It is further contended that the petitioners have been living separately with the deceased and her husband and, as such, they do not have any concern with the day-to-day affairs of the deceased and her husband. The deceased died on account of natural death and when the informant came to know about this fact he has also filed a petition before the jurisdictional court with a clear averments showing no involvement of the petitioners in the crime. It is further contended that on information, the post-mortem of the deceased was conducted, however, no mark of violence was found and since the cause of death could not be ascertained, the opinion is kept reserved till the Forensic Science Laboratory report.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State opposes the bail application and submits that admittedly the



deceased was done to death within seven years of marriage and soon before the death there was allegation of demand of dowry and torture and, as such, offence under Section 304(B) of the Indian Penal Code cannot be ruled out.

6. Regard being had to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the omnibus nature of allegation and the fact that the petitioners are non-else, but the in laws persons, coupled with the fair antecedent and the fact that no mark of violence was found over the body of the deceased, let the petitioners, named above, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-II, Saran at Chhapra in connection with Dighwara P.S. Case No. 190 of 2024, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C. with the further condition that one of the bailors shall be the own/close relative of the petitioners.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

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

