

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81010 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2025 Thana- KUNAU LI District- Supaul

1. Mamta Devi W/O Jitendra Mehta @ Jitendra Kumar Mehta @ Jitu Jitendra Mehta Resident of Village - Kamalpur, Ward No. 01, Police Station - Kunauli, District - Supaul.
2. Lalita Devi @ Lalwati Devi @ Lal Bati Devi @ Lalvati Devi W/O Harkishun Mehta @ Harikishun Mehta @ Harkisun Mehta Resident of Village - Kamalpur, Ward No. 01, Police Station - Kunauli, District - Supaul.
3. Upendra Mehta S/O Harkishun Mehta @ Harikishun Mehta @ Harkisun Mehta Resident of Village - Kamalpur, Ward No. 01, Police Station - Kunauli, District - Supaul.
4. Gobind Mehta @ Govind Mehta S/O Bachha Mehta @ Bachha Mehta Resident of Village - Kamalpur, Ward No. 01, Police Station - Kunauli, District - Supaul.
5. Renu Devi W/O Upendra Mehta Resident of Village - Kamalpur, Ward No. 01, Police Station - Kunauli, District - Supaul.
6. Jitu Jitendra Mehta @ Jitendra Kumar Mehta @ Jitendra Mehta S/O Harikishun Mehta @ Harekishna Mehta @ Harkisun Mehta Resident of Village - Kamalpur, Ward No. 01, Police Station - Kunauli, District - Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Arun, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 15-01-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioners and learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 80,
238 and 3(5) of the B.N.S..

3. It is a case of dowry death. As per prosecution case,



marriage of daughter of informant was solemnized with co-accused Raju Mehta about 5 years ago as per Hindu rites and rituals. It is alleged that after marriage, all the F.I.R. named accused persons, including these petitioners, tortured and harassed the victim for dowry and due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, all the accused persons killed the victim.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. Petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case merely because Petitioner Nos. 1 and 5 happen to be sister-in-law, Petitioner No. 2 happens to be mother-in-law Petitioner Nos. 3 and 6 happen to be brother-in-law of the deceased and Petitioner No. 4 happens to be distant relative of husband of the deceased. Petitioners are separate in mess and property and have got no concern with the affairs of the deceased and her husband. Petitioners claim clean antecedents.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and submitted that petitioners are named in the F.I.R. with specific accusation that they, along with other accused persons, used to torture and harass the victim for dowry



and due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, all of them committed her murder. The deceased died unnatural death at her matrimonial house with seven years of marriage.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, specific and direct nature of accusation, gravity of offence and the fact that the deceased died unnatural death at her matrimonial house with seven years of marriage, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

