

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65937 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-342 Year-2025 Thana- RAJGIR District- Nalanda

=====

Aradhna Kumari W/o Ajit Kumar R/o Mohalla - Panchrukha Kuan, P.S -
Rajgir, District - Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Raj Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Akash Kumar Mishra, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 13-01-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

petitioner, learned APP appearing on behalf of the State and

learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1),
61(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S..

3. The prosecution story, as per written report, in
brief, is that informant's husband, namely late Amarjit Kumar,
was posted in the C.R.P.F. and he came on leave. On
07.05.2025, he went to his *Sasural* to attend a marriage
ceremony and on the next day, the *Barat* departed and thereafter,



on 09.05.2025 at about 8 AM, husband of informant returned to his home at *Rajgir*. On the said night, informant's *Bhaisur*, namely Ajit Kumar and her *Gotni*, i.e. this petitioner, were also at home. In the day time, for execution of a sale deed, some dispute took place between this petitioner and husband of the informant because this petitioner desired to get the sale deed executed in her name. It is further alleged that on 09.05.2025, informant's husband also got a *Challan* issued in his name for registration of the sale deed, which was to be done on the next date i.e. on 10.05.2025 but in the intervening night of 09.05.2025, husband of the informant was strangled to death. Informant's father-in-law informed her that her husband has committed suicide. However, informant believes that her husband has been murdered to death by co-accused Ajit Kumar and this petitioner by strangulation.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. From bare perusal of the F.I.R. it is apparent that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence. The present F.I.R. has been lodged after inordinate delay of one month and there is no plausible explanation for the same. Prior



to lodging of the present F.I.R., a U.D. case was also registered by father of the deceased. As a matter of fact, due to strained relationship with his wife, the deceased committed suicide by hanging. During course of investigation, none of the witnesses have supported the prosecution case. Petitioner is none else than own *Gotni* of the informant and she has falsely been implicated in this case only on suspicion. Petitioner is a lady and claims clean antecedents.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and submitted that petitioner is named in the F.I.R. with specific accusation that she, along with her husband, namely Ajit Kumar, killed the deceased. Even as per the *post mortem* report, multiple injuries were found on the person of the deceased which clearly reflects that the accused persons used criminal force on the deceased and committed his murder. It is a case of cold blooded murder due to family property dispute because the deceased wanted to purchase the land at *Rajgir* in the name of his wife, who happens to be informant of the present case.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case



and specific and direct nature of accusation, the prayer for grant
of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

