

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6906 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-178 Year-2025 Thana- TELHARA District- Nalanda

Kanti Devi Wife of Ramashray Prasad Resident of Village- Mehandichak,
P.S.- Telhara, District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Birendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, A.P.P.
For the informant :	Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh No. 1, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-03-2026 Heard Mr. Birendra Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh No. 1, learned counsel for the informant and Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since 14.11.2025 in connection with Telhara P.S. Case No. 178 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 80, 61, 238 and 3(5) of BNS.

3. The prosecution story, in brief, is that one Munni Yadav Son of Late Sahtu Yadav recorded his fardbeyan on 06.10.2025 at 03.30 P.M in which he alleged precisely therein inter-alia that he solemnized the marriage of his daughter Pramila Devi aged 22 years along with Mitranjan Kumar Son of Ramashray Prasad according to Hindu rites and custom four years ago. After marriage at the time of bidai he gave Rs. 8,00,000/- (Eight Lakh) in cash, one splendor motorcycle and 10



gram gold and jewellery of silver to his daughter. Informant further stated that after marriage his daughter was enjoying her happy conjugal life and two years ago his son namely Karu was also blessed from this bed lock about 1 and 1-1/2 years his daughter was used to torture by father-in-law Ramashray Prasad, Mother-in-law Kanti Devi, Bhaisur Rajesh Kumar and Niranjana Kumar, Gotini Bibha Devi and Nanad Neha Kumari due to dowry. His son-in-law Mitranjan Kumar who was doing the private job out of station sued to instigate to his family for demanding the dowry. His daughter on 05.10.2025 informed through mobile that all family member of her sasural sued to pressurized for dowry and his husband also involved with them. It appears that they will be killed, at this informant try to convince her. It is next alleged that on 06.10.2025 at 09.00 A.M his daughter called and informed that her sasural family members was beating her. Thereafter, her mobile was switched off then informant went at her sasural Mehendichak where he saw that there is no family member at house. Thereafter informant afraid and called to her nearest relative Jitendra Prasad, who happens to his samdhi. Then they reached along with other family members at Mehendichak, thereafter he also informed his villagers, then some persons also come from there.



It is further alleged that in course of search in the paddy field towards west side of Mehanchak village where he found one sack of jute in the bush of date orchard then they reached there where they found dead body of his daughter kept there. Informant informed to the police then police came there. Informant claimed that her daughter was killed by pressing of neck by her father-in-law Ramashray Prasad, Mother-in-law Kanti Devi, elder brother Rajesh Kumar @ Langra, Niranjana Kumar @ Karu both Son of Ramashray Prasad and Bibha Devi, wife of Niranjana Kumar and Nanad Neha Kumari daughter of Ramashray Prasad for demand of dowry.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and is innocent and she has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the allegation as alleged in the FIR is forged and fabricated although the petitioner is named in the FIR. It is next submitted that from bare perusal of the FIR it appears that there is no specific allegation of any overt act against the petitioner and the allegation of demand of dowry is general and omnibus in nature against the all the accused persons including the petitioner. It is further submitted that the cause of death as mentioned in the postmortem report is Asphyxia due to



strangulation. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that for the same set of allegation, two accused persons namely, Ramashray Prasad and Rajesh Kumar @ Guddu Kumar have been granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 24.02.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 7497 of 2026 and husband of the deceased, who is happened to be the son of the petitioner, has been in custody since 07.02.2026 and the police after investigation has submitted charge-sheet and the petitioner is in custody since 14.11.2025.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for the informant, on the other hand, have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and that petitioner has clean antecedent and also the fact that for the same set of allegation, two accused persons namely, Ramashray Prasad and Rajesh Kumar @ Guddu Kumar have been granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 24.02.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 7497 of 2026 by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned ACJM-1st, Hilsa, Nalanda in connection with Telhara



P.S. Case No. 178 of 2025, subject to the following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be canceled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that 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 above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

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

