

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37998 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-453 Year-2025 Thana- VAISHALI District- Vaishali

Geeta Devi Wife of Shree Sahindar Rai @ Sahindar Rai Resident of Village-
Jafraha, P.S.- Vaishali, District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Prakash Chandra Jha, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Rajendra Nath Jha, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 27-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection
with Vaishali P.S. Case No.453 of 2025 for allegedly having
committed offences under Sections 80, 238 and 3(5) of B.N.S.

3. As per the prosecution story, which has been lodged
on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant, to
the effect that his daughter was married with the co-accused,
Manish Kumar around four years back in 2021 as per the Hindu
rites and rituals. In the marriage, he spent around 1,50,000/- and
gave articles worth Rs.1,50,000/- in gift. It has further been
alleged that thereafter all the accused persons started demanding
a gold chain and a motorcycle in dowry and when the demand
of dowry was not fulfilled, the accused persons started



assaulting and abusing the daughter of the informant. The said fact was informed to the informant, who tried to pacify the matter and for which *Panchayati* was also held, however the accused persons continued to harass the daughter of the informant. The informant tried to take his daughter with him but the same was refused and subsequently on 03.07.2025 at around 07:00 p.m., the informant came to know that his daughter has been killed by the accused persons, including the petitioner. When he reached her *Sasural*, he found that the entire family members have disappeared along with the body of his deceased daughter.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the mother-in-law and she is an old lady and the allegation levelled in the First Information Report against her are totally false. He submits that the daughter of the informant died due to heart attack and the same was conveyed to the informant. He reached the *Sasural* of his daughter and participated in the last rites, however later on he filed the present First Information Report. He further submits that no such demand was ever made by the petitioner or her family members and only general and omnibus allegation of demand of dowry has been made in the First Information Report. He



submits that one of the co-accused, namely Sahindar Rai has been granted regular bail by a Hon'ble Single Judge of this Court vide order dated 01.04.2026 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No.5770 of 2026, that too after framing of charge. He further submits that one other co-accused has been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail vide order dated 17.07.2026 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No.31744 of 2026 by a Hon'ble Single Judge of this Court. He also submits that the petitioner has got a clean antecedent.

5. *Per contra*, the learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and submits that the daughter of the informant was killed by the petitioner and her family members and therefore the petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and after going through the records as well as the case diary, it would transpire that the post mortem report is not available along with the case diary since the body of the deceased was not found. It has been alleged in the case diary by the witnesses that the accused persons disposed of the body of the deceased daughter of the informant. The petitioner along with other accused persons fled away from her house with the dead body.



7. Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid as well as the serious nature of allegations, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Ritesh Kumar, J.)

Sanjay/-

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

