

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 47171 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-255 Year-2026 Thana- SULTANGANJ District- Bhagalpur

Neelam Devi W/o Ram Dhani Yadav Resident of Shyambag, PS- Sultanganj,
District- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhumay Madhup

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 331(7), 118(2), 109, 103(1) and 61(2) of the BNS as well as Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and is a woman and the informant alleges that on getting information about firing by 5-6 criminals at the office of Nagar Parishad, Sultanganj causing firearm injury to the Chairman of Nagar Parishad the informant reached the place of occurrence and found the Chairman and Executive Officer of the Nagar Parishad lying in pool of blood. Both the injured were taken to the hospital where the Executive Officer was declared dead and the Chairman was referred to a



higher hospital, thereafter the CCTV footage was examined and the assailants were identified as Ramdhani, Deepak and Pinku.

4. Learned counsel on behalf of the petitioner submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest petitioner is not named in the FIR, it is further submitted that petitioner being wife of Ramdhani Yadav, a dreaded criminal, came to be implicated in the instant case, it is also submitted that not only the petitioner but her entire family members have been implicated in the instant case, it is next submitted that the FIR does not even remotely suggest that in the CCTV footage the petitioner was at the place of occurrence when the occurrence took place. It is further submitted that during the course of investigation also nothing transpired connecting the petitioner with the occurrence except statement of the wife of the deceased chairman recorded at para 295 of the case diary as recorded in the order impugned.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner may not have committed the occurrence of firing but then her husband was seen in the CCTV footage of committing the occurrence of murder of two innocent persons along with two other accused persons, it is further submitted based on order



impugned that petitioner being wife of Ramdhani Yadav was elected as the Chairman of the Nagar Parishad but subsequently in the year 2022 she lost the election and the deceased became the Chairman, it is next submitted that statement of the wife of the deceased Chairman was recorded at para 295 of the case diary wherein she stated that petitioner was Chairman but in the year 2022 deceased Ramdhani Yadav became the Chairman and the petitioner became Deputy Chairman and since then she along with her husband and sons were exerting pressure upon the deceased Chairman to work in their favour but since deceased Chairman was impartial in discharging his duty hence they got enraged and had threatened to kill the Chairman and the executive officer, further before the Election Commission, Patna the eligibility of the petitioner with regard to her election was under challenge and the said case was to be taken on 30.05.2026 in which the deceased i.e. Chairman and Executive Officer had to participate but prior to that date the Chairman and the Executive Officer were killed by Ramdhani Yadav and other accused persons.

6. Learned A.P.P. next submits that the Investigating Officer procured the CDR and tower locations of all the accused and suspects including the petitioner herein and on the basis of



technical and scientific investigation came to a considered conclusion about the involvement of petitioner in the crime. It is further submitted that witnesses in their statement recorded under section 183 BNSS have recorded that threat was given to the deceased Chairman and the Executive Officer by the petitioner in the month of December 2025, it is also submitted that process under section 82 Cr.P.C. has also been issued against the petitioner which amply demonstrates that petitioner is absconding. It is next submitted that if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence, it is also submitted that interrogation of the petitioner in the case is required for eliciting the truth behind the occurrence of two murder.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikram/-

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

