

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43853 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-101 Year-2024 Thana- Pothia District- Katihar

=====

Ganga Kumari @ Ganga W/o Prashant Kumar, D/o Anirudwa Poddar R/o
vill- Darji Bharti patti, Banmankhi, P.O. and P.S.- Banmanki, Distt.- Purnea
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ram Babu Yadav, Advocate Mr. Umesh Kumar Yadav, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Ms. Pushpa Sinha, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Mukesh Kumar Jha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 409-02-2026
1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80(2) and 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his daughter was married to Ajit on 1-3-2023, after



marriage the accused persons including the petitioner started torturing his daughter for non-fulfillment of dowry demand of a motorcycle and Rs. 10 lakhs for purchasing land, further the victim also disclosed that Ajit is having an extra marital affairs with Ganga (petitioner) and when the victim protested the relationship, Ajit threatened that if demand is not met, he will marry Ganga, further Ajit on 26-10- 2024 informed from an unknown number that victim died, accordingly he along with the family members reached the place of occurrence and found the dead body of the victim lying inside a room with multiple injury marks and the accused persons had fled.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence. It is further submitted that it is not in dispute that police was informed and the dead body of the victim was recovered after breaking the door, which amply demonstrates that victim had committed suicide. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that in sum and substance the allegation against the petitioner is that she was having an extra marital relation with the husband of the deceased and when the said relationship was objected by the



deceased, she was threatened by Ajit leading to the occurrence. It is also submitted that petitioner is a government school teacher and is married to Prashant Kumar, as would manifest from the photographs annexed with the supplementary affidavit. It is further submitted that during course of investigation, it transpired that deceased was having an affair with one Siddhant and call details and chats were retrieved by the Investigating Officer, it is thus submitted that it appears that since her relationship with Siddhant was objected, as such, the occurrence was committed, but then a false allegation came to be alleged that Ajit was having an affair with the petitioner. It is further submitted that since petitioner is married from before and is a government school teacher why the petitioner would have been in a relationship with Ajit. It is further submitted that since Ajit and petitioner both are teacher and had met during their training and since they were known, as such, the informant implicated the petitioner. It is also submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove her innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, but then are not in a



position to rebut the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is a government school teacher and is a married lady and during the course of investigation, it transpired that deceased was in a relationship with Siddhant.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Pothiya Katihar P.S. Case No. 101 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. However, it is made clear that in the event if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned Trial Court bringing to its notice that petitioner despite giving assurance to this Court is not co-operating in the investigation, in that event the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.



8. Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned police station through the learned Trial Court.

9. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

