

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17391 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-306 Year-2024 Thana- BARBIGHA District- Sheikhpura

Rinta Devi W/o Aklu Manjhi R/o Village- Khoja Gachi, P.O. and P.S.-
Barbigaha, District- Sheikhpura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dr. Anjani Pd. Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Priya Sharan Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Barbigaha PS Case No. 306 of 2024 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 80, 238 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody
since 13.02.2026 and the informant alleges that her daughter
was married to Chandan in the year 2018 and out of wedlock,
two sons were born, on 18-11-2024, the informant received an
information that her daughter died, accordingly, she reached the
place of occurrence, but did not find anyone, as accused persons
had absconded, nor her daughter was present, thus alleges that



accused persons including the petitioner killed her daughter and dispose of the dead body.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, being mother-in-law. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that no allegation of demand of dowry is alleged. It is further submitted that no doubt the victim died within 7 years of marriage but then all deaths are not dowry death. It is further submitted that informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence and the entire allegation hinges around suspicion.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the victim died within 7 years of marriage, as such, presumption in law is against the husband and his family members. It is also submitted that even body was disposed of as such postmortem of the dead body could not be carried out or else the cause of death could have been ascertained. It is further submitted that had the petitioner not been involved in the occurrence, in that event, efforts would have been made to ensure that the dead body is sent for postmortem for ascertaining the cause of death



but then the body was disposed of. It is further submitted that husband single handedly could not have disposed of the dead body.

6. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Aklu Manjhi had approached this Court seeking regular bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.61683 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 08.09.2025 passed by a learned coordinate Bench, it is thus submitted that parity be maintained.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and also taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is a woman and father-in-law has been granted the privilege of regular bail, the petitioner above-named, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Barbigha P.S. Case No.306 of 2024.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

