

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40665 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-214 Year-2025 Thana- RAMPUR HARI District- Muzaffarpur

Pinki Devi W/o Vijay Bhagat @ Bijli @ Vijay Kumar R/o Village-
Majhauriya, P.S- Rampurhari, Dist- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mithlesh Kumar Khare

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection
with Rampurhari P.S. Case No. 214 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 238 and 3(5) of the
BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman and
the informant alleges that both his maternal grandsons were
living with their father and step mother (petitioner), further they
used to assault his grandson, next alleges that his minor
grandson was missing since last nine days, but his son-in-law
did not bother to file a missing complaint, it is further alleged
that in conspiracy, it appears that father and step mother of his



maternal grandson have killed him and have concealed his body.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case being step mother. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the allegations are general and omnibus in nature and informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that the dead body of the child was found from a brick kiln. It is next submitted that the child was missing for nine days, but neither the father nor the step mother took any steps for instituting an FIR, which amply demonstrates their conduct and also points to the fact about their involvement in the occurrence. It is next submitted that it was informant who after nine days instituted the instant FIR, as such, no case came to be instituted from the side of the petitioner or her husband, which amply demonstrates that accused persons were aware that the child is no more and dead body of the child was recovered. It is also submitted that investigating in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the



privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

