

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72322 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-246 Year-2025 Thana- CHAPRA TOWN District- Saran

Suman Devi Wife of Vishal Kumar Resident of Village - Krishnapuri, Police line, Hawai adda, ward no.-15, P.S.- Chapra Town, District - Saran.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Shambhavi, Advocate
	:	Ms. Aashi Wats, Advocate
	:	Ms. Mili Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Yogendra Kumar Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since 10.05.2025 in connection with Chapra Town P.S. Case No. 246 of 2025 for the offence punishable under Section 103(1) of BNS.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 07.05.2025 at about 20:12 hours Geeta Devi, wife of the informant was set on fire by Suman Devi, daughter-in-law of the informant and on getting information about the alleged occurrence on mobile phone, the informant and his son came at home and found Geeta Devi in an injured condition who disclosed that while she was sleeping, the petitioner applied



match- box to her sari and went on the roof and when she received burn injury on her person, petitioner came and thrown water on her person and in course of treatment, Geeta Devi died on 09.05.2025 at 06.00 A.M.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and is innocent and she has falsely been 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. It is next submitted that petitioner is daughter-in-law of the deceased and due to some petty dispute the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by the informant for the reason best known to him. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Investigating Officer has visited the place of occurrence and he has not found any mark of smoke or burn at the place of occurrence which suggests that the place of occurrence is doubtful. Apart from aforesaid, there is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence and merely based on suspicion, the petitioner has been made accused in the present case. Apart from aforesaid, no cogent material suggests that the petitioner is involved in the present case and that the police after investigation submitted the charge



sheet against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 10.05.2025.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the fact that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody since 10.05.2025, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Sessions Judge-15th, Saran at Chapra in connection with Chapra Town P.S. Case No. 246 of 2025, subject to the following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, her bail bond shall be canceled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at



any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed her criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

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

