

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81013 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-236 Year-2025 Thana- SINGHESHWAR District- Madhepura

Sangita Devi wife of Akhilesh Yadav Resident Of Village- Kataiya P S-
Singheshwar District -Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, Advocate Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate Mrs.Pooja Prasad, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Rupesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 05-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner; learned
counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Singheshwar P.S. Case No. 236 of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 352, 351(2), 80, 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that Gunjan Kumari (deceased) was married with Shekhar Yadav in the year 2019. It is further alleged that at the time of marriage, sufficient gifts were provided. She was subjected to cruelty on account of the non-fulfillment of the dowry demand of Rs. 5 lakhs. It is further alleged that she was killed by the in-laws and was also



attempted to be electrocuted.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the stepmother-in-law of the deceased, and from perusal of the postmortem report, the cause of death is cardiorespiratory due to high-voltage electrocution. He also submits that the deceased died due to electrocution and she was not killed by anybody. Moreover, the husband is already in custody. He further submits that a statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner has no criminal antecedent and she is languishing in judicial custody since 07.07.2025.

5. The application for bail is vehemently opposed by the learned counsel for the informant and the learned APP for the State. Learned counsel for the informant submits that at the instance of this lady (the petitioner), the deceased was killed.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties



of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief
Judicial Magistrate, Madhepura in connection with Singheshwar
P.S. Case No. 236 of 2025.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

