

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19343 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-302 Year-2021 Thana- SHRIKRISHNAPURI District- Patna

1. Jai Narain Singh @ Jai Narayan Singh Son of Late Kamla Prasad Singh R/o - Jyoti Kunj, New Punaichak, West Boring Canal Road, P.S.- Shri Krishnapuri, District - Patna
2. Sarita Singh @ Rinku Devi Wife of Shri Satyendra Singh R/o - Jyoti Kunj, New Punaichak, West Boring Canal Road, P.S.- Shri Krishnapuri, District - Patna
3. Satyendra Singh Son of Shri Jai Narain Singh R/o - Jyoti Kunj, New Punaichak, West Boring Canal Road, P.S.- Shri Krishnapuri, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Awdhesh Kumar, Advocate Mr. Vijayansh Pratap Singh, Advocate Mr. Shashikant Amar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Anil Prasad Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ranjan Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-04-2026 Heard learned counsels for the petitioners as well as the informant and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Shri Krishnapuri P.S. Case No. 302 of 2021 in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302, 201, 120B/34 of the IPC.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant's daughter was married to the co-accused person, Devendra



Narayan Singh in the year 2000. She was subjected to mental torture by her husband and in-laws due to his illicit affair. On 26.10.2021, the informant was informed about his daughter's death, whereafter upon query made by the informant, the petitioners stated that the deceased died due to accidental fall, but the informant came to know at his level that she was done to death.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits at the outset that the petitioners are father-in-law aged about 85 years, sister-in-law and brother-in-law of the deceased respectively. It has been further submitted that marriage of the deceased with co-accused Devendra Narayan Singh dates back to the year 2000 and after 21 years of marriage, the present FIR has been lodged that too after delay of seven days of the information received by the informant that his daughter had died. It is further submitted that the deceased was actually being treated in some addiction-cum-rehabilitation centre and she was not mentally very stable and as a matter of fact, she accidentally fell down from the terrace on 17.10.2021. Thereafter, she was admitted in Ruban Hospital, Patna by petitioner nos. 2 and 3 for treatment. It is further submitted that both the children of the deceased aged about 20 years and 16 years, have not stated about any foul play



by the accused persons in their statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. or of any foul play. As a matter of fact, some missing report had been filed earlier too, with regard to the deceased having gone away from her house while living in Banaras.

5. Learned counsel has further submitted that after investigation, the police had submitted a final form on account of lack of evidence, however, differing with the said final form, cognizance has been taken by the learned jurisdictional Magistrate.

6. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant however, vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail of the petitioners on the ground that no postmortem was conducted on the dead body of the deceased and the reports of the Ruban Hospital indicates certain injuries on her body which have not been sufficiently explained.

7. In response to the same, it has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that explanation for injuries is that she had fallen from the terrace and the postmortem has not been conducted on account of the fact that the informant had already been informed about the death of the deceased. It has specifically been averred in paragraph 18 of the



bail application that the management of Ruban Hospital has informed the then, SHO, Patliputra regarding treatment of the victim but the police did not respond to the same as such, it has been submitted that it was actually petitioner nos. 2 and 3 who had taken the deceased to Ruban Hospital for treatment and an information was also given to the SHO. The petitioners are persons of clean antecedents and have been made accused on the fact that they are family members of the husband of the deceased.

8. Besides the facts and circumstances of the case, it is taken into consideration that petitioner no. 1 is an old man aged about 85 years suffering with paralysis (Annexure-2). Further, considering the fact that these petitioners have been made accused on account of their relationship with the husband of the deceased with whom she had some matrimonial dispute on account of his alleged illicit relationship with petitioner no. 2 and noting the fact that the husband of petitioner no. 2, Satyendra Singh (petitioner no. 3), has also been made accused in this case, let the above named petitioners, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, 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 the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Shri Krishnapuri P.S. Case No. 302 of 2021, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the B.N.S.S., subject to the condition that:

(I) The petitioner nos. 2 and 3 shall appear on each and every date and if the petitioners do not appear on two consecutive dates fixed in the case without any substantial and satisfactory reason thereby delaying the trial, the learned court below would be at liberty to cancel their bail bonds.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

priyanka/-

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

