

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40398 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-244 Year-2024 Thana- KANTI District- Muzaffarpur

Sonam Kumari Saurabh Kumar @ Saurabh Saheb R/o Village-Chainpur
Baikunth Nagar, P.S- Kanti, District- Muzaffarpur. at present residing at
village-Panapur Kariat, P.S-Panapur, District-Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anuj Kumar
For the State : Mr. Brajendra Nath Pandey

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 10-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. This is the second attempt on behalf of the petitioner
for grant of bail in connection with Kanti P.S. Case No. 244 of
2024 registered for the offence under Sections 302/34 of the IPC.

3. Earlier, the bail application of the petitioner has been
rejected by this Court vide order dated 20.11.2024 passed in Cr.
Misc. No. 59141 of 2024, which reads as follows:

*“Heard the learned counsel for the
petitioner, learned APP for the State and learned
counsel for the informant.*

*2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in
connection with Kanti P.S. Case No. 244 of 2024
registered for the offence under Sections 302/34 of the
Indian Penal Code.*

3. As per the prosecution case, the deceased



was called by the petitioner in her house and there the deceased was killed. It has come during investigation that the deceased was killed inside the house by the petitioner and her son. The murder weapon has been recovered from the house of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner; Mr. Ajay Thakur submits that the petitioner is a lady and in the confessional statement of Saundarya Saurabh, it has come that the deceased was killed by the Saundarya Saurabh and not by the petitioner. The petitioner has cleaned the blood stains in the house. Petitioner is in custody since 12.05.2024.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and have submitted that it is the petitioner who had called the deceased in her house and thereafter in a planned manner; the deceased was killed by the petitioner and her son. He further submits that the exoneration of the petitioner by the co-accused will not entitle her for grant of bail.

6. I have considered the submissions of the parties.

7. Though the petitioner is a lady but in the facts of the case when she has participated in the conspiracy and the actual killing of the deceased, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this application for regular bail is dismissed.”

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the trial has been delayed and after the order of this Court, the case has been committed and the charges have been framed. Therefore,



the petitioner deserves bail who is in custody since 12.05.2024.

5. Considering the gravity of the offence and also the fact that the charge has been framed, I am not inclined to review my earlier order.

6. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

7. The learned trial Judge is directed to conclude the trial at the earliest by giving short adjournment.

8. Learned counsel for the informant Mr. Ajeet Kumar submits that the prosecution will produce the witnesses on the date fixed by the learned Court below.

9. The S.S.P., Muzaffarpur is directed to ensure the appearance of the witnesses in the trial so that the trial is not delayed.

10. If the trial will be delayed by the prosecution, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

11. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the Principal District Judge, Muzaffarpur and S.S.P., Muzaffarpur forthwith through FAX or e-mail for its compliance.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

priyanka/-

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

