

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38416 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-127 Year-2025 Thana- BARHAT District- Jamui

1. Sonali Kumari wife of Pappu Mandal @ Kundan Kumar Resident of Village- Tetariya, Darha, P.S.-Barhat, District- Jamui
2. Lakho Kumari Daughter of Kartik Mandal Resident of Village- Tetariya, Darha, P.S.-Barhat, District- Jamui
3. Sunita Devi Wife of Kartik Mandal Resident of Village- Tetariya, Darha, P.S.-Barhat, District- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Mishra, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Prem Kumar Jha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 23-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Barhat P.S. Case No. 127 of 2025, registered under Sections 103(1), 352, 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 the his sister was married in 2007 to one Pappu Mandal and she gave birth to a daughter namely, Anupriti Kumari. Her sister was killed in 2010 by her husband for which a case is pending in Jamui Court and thereafter Pappu



Mandal married another lady namely, Sonali Kumari (petitioner no. 1) and then he started assaulting and using filthy languages against the daughter of her sister namely, Anupriti Kumari. Finally on 20.08.2025, the daughter of her sister namely, Anupriti Kumari has been killed by the persons named in the FIR, including the petitioners herein. Thereafter when she received information on 21.08.2025, she went to village Tetariya, where Anupriti Kumari was killed, however it was informed that all of them have taken her to Jamui Hospital. When she went to Jamui Hospital, she was abused and filthy languages were used against her. Subsequently the present FIR has been lodged.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that no offence, as has alleged in the FIR has taken place. He submits that no eye witness was present at the place of occurrence and the dead body was found in an orchard. He further submits that Anupriti Kumari was a stubborn type of girl and she used to lose her temper on small issues. Since, she was not given mobile phone, she fled away from her house and when she did not return till evening, then her father and mother (petitioner no.1) went to Jamui Bank for the purposes of loan and later on they came to know that Anupriti Kumari has



committed suicide in an orchad. He further submits that during course of investigation it has also transpired that the informant also came to village Tetariya and told Anupriti Kumari not to talk much on mobile phone and she also took her mobile phone with herself and due to that she was depressed. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner no. 1 is the step-mother, the petitioner no. 2 is cousin sister and the petitioner no. 3 is the aunt of the deceased. He submits that the petitioner no. 2 and petitioner no. 3 live separately from Pappu Mandal and his family. He further submits that even during course of post-mortem, no external injuries have been found by the doctor. He submits that the petitioners have got a clean antecedents.

5. *Per contra*, the leaned APP appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that specific allegation have been leveled against the petitioner and others with regard to torturing the deceased and they have killed the deceased. He submits that in the post-mortem report, ligature mark has been found on the neck of the deceased, therefore the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the rival submissions and after going



through the record and the case diary as well as the post-mortem report, it appears that during course of investigation the witnesses have supported the case of the prosecution and further from perusal of the post-mortem report it transpired that the ligature mark 1.5" around neck, approximately 2" mark over thyroid cartilage and the tongue has caught between the teeth have been found by the doctor, who had conducted the post-mortem of the deceased. It further appears that some of the witnesses, who have been examined during course of investigation have supported the case of the informant. Considering the above, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly the anticipatory bail petition is hereby rejected.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

shital/-

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

