

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38789 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-35 Year-2026 Thana- Mau District- Gaya

Manju Devi W/o Anirudh Kumar @ Anrudh Kumar Resident of Village-
Mahuari, P.S.- Mau, District- Gaya Ji

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rakesh Kumar S/o Late Rajeshwar Singh Resident of Village- Ular, P.O.-
Bharatpura, P.S.- Dulhin Bazar, District- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. SK Lal, Sr. Advocate
	:	Mr. Ashutosh Tripathy
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Anish Chandra

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 22-06-2026 Heard Mr. SK Lal, learned Senior Counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Anish Chandra, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since
16.03.2026 in connection with Mau P.S. Case No. 35 of 2026
for the offences punishable under Sections 80, 238 and 3(5) of
the BNS.

3. Prosecution case, in brief, as per written report of
the informant Rakesh Kumar is that the marriage of his daughter
was solemnized on 21.04.2024 as per Hindu rites and rituals
with Priyaranjan Kumar @ Sanu Kumar and at the time of
marriage jewellery, cash and other household articles worth



Rs.15,00,000/- were given. It is further alleged that after some time of marriage, the accused/petitioner and his family members started demanding Rs.5,00,000/- additional dowry and due to non-fulfillment, the accused persons started torturing the informant's daughter physically and mentally and further threatened to face dire consequences. On 11.03.2026 at about 7:45 P.M., the informant contacted his daughter on mobile phone and that time she did not complain anything ill. It is further alleged that on 12.03.2026, some other person informed that his daughter has been killed and her body has been cremated. It is further alleged that he has apprehension that her daughter has been killed by the accused/petitioner and his family members.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and is innocent and she has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the allegation as alleged in the FIR is forged and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. It is further submitted that petitioner has been made an accused in this merely on the ground that she is mother-in-law of the deceased. It is next submitted that it appears from the FIR that although the petitioner is named in



the FIR but there is no specific allegation of assault or overt act or demand of dowry attributed against the petitioner rather the allegations are general and omnibus in nature. It is next submitted that the date of occurrence as alleged in the FIR is 12.03.2026 but the FIR has been instituted on 14.03.2026 i.e., after a delay of two days without giving any explanation of delay. It is also submitted that the victim has committed suicide herself and husband of the deceased who is happened to be the son of the petitioner is in custody since 25.03.2026. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner next submits that the police after investigation has submitted charge-sheet and the petitioner is in custody since 16.03.2026.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned JMFC, Gaya ji in connection with Mau P.S. Case No. 35 of 2026 subject to the following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court



and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, her bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

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

