

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18673 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-173 Year-2025 Thana- TIKAPATTI District- Purnia

1. Pawan Singh @ Pawan kumar Singh Son of Late Phulesh Singh Residnet Of State Boring Tola Goryari, Ps- Tikapatti District- Punrea
2. Vibha Devi wife of Kundan Mandal @ Kundan Kumar Residnet Of State Boring Tola Goryari, Ps- Tikapatti District- Punrea
3. Suhani Kumari Daughter of Kundan Mandal @ Kundan Kumar Residnet Of State Boring Tola Goryari, Ps- Tikapatti District- Punrea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bhola Prasad
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rabindra Kumar- A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 18-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 303(2), 108 and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and petitioner nos.2 and 3 are women and the informant, who is father of the deceased, alleges that his son Shubham was married to Suhani on 02.05.2025. It is next alleged that on 23.10.2025, Shubham had gone to the parental house of his wife to fetch her back to



her matrimonial home but the mother-in-law of Shubham did not allow his wife to go back to her matrimonial home thereafter on 27.10.2025, the mother-in-law of Shubham called him and asked him to come and take his wife to her matrimonial home. Accordingly, Shumbham went to her in-laws' place on 27.10.2025, where the named accused persons including the petitioners assaulted him and even snatched his motorcycle and Rs.11,000/- thereafter Shubham came back and went in depression and committed suicide.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of Para-11 of the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that description of the petitioners is given as petitioner no.1 is a villager of petitioner nos.2 and 3, while petitioner no.2 is mother-in-law of the deceased and petitioner no.3 is wife of the deceased. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation that alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that the accused persons including the petitioners abetted Shubham in committing suicide. It is next submitted that merely because the wife did not go back to her matrimonial home that in itself cannot be a ground for Shubham for taking extreme



steps of ending his life by committing suicide.

5. The learned A.P.P. Sri Rabindra Kumar vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that Shubham on two occasions had gone to the parental house of his wife for fetching her back to her matrimonial home but on both the occasions the mother-in-law of Shubham did not allow his wife to accompany him. It is also submitted that it is specifically alleged that the mother-in-law of Shubham had called him on 27.10.2025 and had asked him to come to fetch back his wife to her matrimonial home based on which Shubham went to the house of his wife where he was humiliated and his motorcycle along with Rs.11,000/- is alleged to have been snatched. It is thus submitted that conduct of the family members of his wife was such which might have created conditions conducive for Shubham to take the extreme steps of ending his life as he might be feeling that he was not in a position to show his face in the society as his wife was refusing to come with him. It is also submitted that investigation of the case is still continuing.

6. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioners submits that even presuming what has been



alleged is true without admitting, then thrust of the allegation is against petitioner no.2 that is mother-in-law of Shubham who did not allow his wife to accompany him. It is also submitted that petitioner no.1 is a co-villager and since is a neighbor of petitioner nos.2 and 3, hence he also came to be implicated with general and omnibus allegations. It is next submitted that as far as wife of Shubham is concerned, she is of impressionable age that is 18 years and might not be in a position to defy her mother, hence may not have accompanied Shubham. It is thus submitted that if the allegations are examined threadbare, it would manifest that thrust of the allegation is against petitioner no.2, as such, seeks permission to withdraw the anticipatory bail application with respect to petitioner no.2, Vibha Devi.

7. Permission is accorded.

8. Accordingly, instant petition is dismissed as withdrawn with respect to petitioner no.2, Vibha Devi.

9. So far as petitioner nos.1 and 3 are concerned, the **petitioner nos.1 and 3**, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, are directed to be released on anticipatory bail on their furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each 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 Tikapatti P. S. Case No. 173 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

10. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

