IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.61229 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010897322026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-37 Year-2025 Thana- KARTAHA District- Vaishali

==========

Priyanka Devi wife of Late Mithlesh Paswan Resident of Village - Bhatauli Bhagwan, P.S.- Kartaha, District -Vaishali

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Anil Kumar, A.P.P.

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA

ORAL ORDER

3 20-11-2026 Heard Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Anil Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who has been in custody since 17.03.2025 in connection with Kartaha P.S. Case No. 37 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1) and 3(5) of BNS.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that Mithilesh Paswan is the son of the informant, and Priyanka Devi, the daughter-in-law of the informant, was married to him about ten years ago. It is alleged that, for the last three years, accused Priyanka Devi had been involved in an extramarital relationship with an unidentified person, which led to frequent disputes between Mithilesh Paswan and Priyanka Devi. It is further alleged that, on 14.03.2025, during the night, upon hearing

WEB COPY

noises emanating from the room of Mithilesh Paswan, the informant's wife, Shanti Devi, his son Vikash Kumar, and his daughter-in-law Neetu Devi rushed to the room, where they allegedly found that accused Priyanka Devi had inflicted severe injuries on Mithilesh Paswan's head with a brick, caused an incised wound on his private part with a knife, and strangulated him using a mosquito net. Upon seeing them, accused Priyanka Devi allegedly fled from the place of occurrence. Thereafter, the informant took Mithilesh Paswan to the hospital, where the attending doctor declared him dead. The informant further alleged that accused Priyanka Devi, in conspiracy with the aforesaid unidentified person, had committed the murder of his son. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, the present FIR came to be instituted.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the earlier bail application preferred by the petitioner was rejected *vide* order dated 28.01.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 82703 of 2025. Thereafter, the petitioner again approached this Court seeking regular bail, which was also rejected *vide* order dated 01.07.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 41468 of 2026. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and she has falsely been

WEB COPY

implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the allegation as alleged in the FIR is forged and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing on behalf of the State, on the other hand, has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submitted that there are direct and specific allegations against the petitioner that she had cut the private part of the deceased with a knife and assaulted him with a brick. It is further submitted that the postmortem report of the deceased also corroborates the allegations made in the FIR.

6. Considering the nature of allegation as alleged in the FIR supported by the medical evidence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail in connection with Kartaha P.S. Case No. 37 of 2025 pending in the court of learned Court No. 8, J.M.-1st Class, Vaishali at Hajipur.

7. Prayer is refused.

8. However, the learned trial court is directed to expedite and conclude the trial at the earliest.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

U		T	

WEB COPY