

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87721 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-302 Year-2025 Thana- KARAHGAR District- Rohtas

Shanti Kuwr @ Shanti Kuer Wife of Late Hiralal Thakur @ Hira Thakur @
Hiralal Sharma Resident of village - Baheri, P.S.- Kargahar, District - Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Babu Nandan Prasad, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Pranav Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Tiwari, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY

ORAL ORDER

4 24-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Karahgar P.S. Case no. 302 of 2025 registered under sections 80(2), 238(a) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, the daughter of the informant was married to the son of the petitioner in April, 2024. It is further stated that she was tortured by the accused persons including the petitioner herein, who happens to be her



mother-in-law, and finally she was done to death. Her body was disposed of.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case only for the reason that she happens to be the mother-in-law of the deceased. There is delay in lodging of the FIR. No independent witness has supported the prosecution case. The petitioner is in custody since 18.9.2025 and chargesheet has been submitted in the case. It is finally submitted that the husband of the deceased is in custody since 14.11.2025.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the petitioner who happens to be the mother-in-law of the deceased has been named in the FIR with allegations levelled against her. It is further submitted that the accused persons disposed of the dead body.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations against the petitioner in the FIR, the petitioner being the mother-in-law of the deceased and the accused persons having disposed of the dead body, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.



7. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew her prayer for bail after framing of charge or after three months, whichever is later.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

saurovkrishna/-

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

