

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14038 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-707 Year-2025 Thana- GARKHA District- Saran

1. Nitu Kumari W/O Late Ranjit Sah, D/O Shiv Kumar Sah R/o Vill.- Pirauna, P.S - Garkha, District - Chapra, Saran. At Present Add. Vill.- Rasulpur, P.S.- Derni, Dist.- Saran.
2. Shima Devi W/O Shiv Kumar Sah R/o Vill.- Pirauna, P.S - Garkha, District - Chapra, Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Binod Murari Mishra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ravi Prakash, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEEN KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 30-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners have preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Garkha P.S. Case No. 707 of 2025 dated 22.09.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 61(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. As per the allegation, the marriage of petitioner No.1 was performed with the deceased on 29.04.2024. It is alleged that petitioner No.1 and her family members were forcing the deceased for a divorce. On the fateful day i.e. on 18.09.2025, the petitioner No.1 is alleged to have taken her jewellery from the almirah and was pressurizing her deceased



husband to accompany him to her parental house. It is alleged that on 20.09.2025, the informant got information as regards the death of his deceased son Ranjeet Sah. After she got a prior information from his matrimonial home that his physical condition is not good and on way it was stated that the deceased son of the informant was being taken to Sadar Hospital, Chapra for treatment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that there is delay of two days in lodging of the present FIR and the opinion of death as per the post-mortem report is that the death cannot be ascertained and viscera was kept preserved for chemical analysis. Learned counsel for the petitioners has also submitted that there was no external or internal injury on the person of the deceased. It has further been submitted that as per the FSL report which was called for on earlier occasion by order dated 12.03.2026 goes to show that “No alkaloidal, pesticidal, volatile, metal poison or drugs could be detected in the contents of exhibit marked 1 and 2 as described above”. Hence, referring to post-mortem report as well as the FSL report, it has been submitted that this is not a case of murder or unnatural death. It has further been submitted that the informant as per own admission was informed about the bad physical condition of the



deceased and it was also informed that he was being taken to a local hospital for treatment. The inquest report of the deceased was prepared at the Sadar Hospital, Chapra which further shows that he was under treatment at the said hospital. The petitioners are in custody since 17.12.2025 having no criminal antecedent and petitioners undertake to co-operate in the trial. The petitioner No.2 happens to be the mother-in-law of the deceased and against both the petitioners there are absolutely no material against them.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the bail petition of the petitioners and have stated that the petitioners are wife and mother-in-law of the deceased and there are strong circumstances against them.

6. Heard the parties and perused the record, the petitioners above-named, are directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Court concerned, Saran at Chapra , in connection with Garkha P.S. Case No. 707 of 2025, with following conditions:-

(i) The petitioners are directed to co-operate in the



trial and be well represented on each and every date fixed in the trial and failure to appear on two consecutive dates, the court below would be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioners.

(ii) It is further directed that the petitioners will not tamper with the evidence and if they do so, appropriate application be filed by the prosecution side.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Praveen Kumar, J)

shivam/-

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

