

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91285 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-278 Year-2025 Thana- LALGANJ District- Vaishali

-
1. Chandani Devi @ Chanda Devi W/o Loha Singh R/o Village - Panchdamiya, P.S - Kartahan, District - Vaishali
 2. Sunny Kumar @ Summy Kumar S/o Loha Singh R/o Village - Panchdamiya, P.S - Kartahan, District - Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Pramod Kumar
For the State	:	Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad
For the informant	:	Mr. Praveen Ranjan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 5 06-05-2026 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners, learned Counsel for the informant and learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the State.
2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out of Lalganj Police Station Case No. 278 of 2025, dated 12.06.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80/3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
3. The prosecution case, as per the First Informant Report, is that the marriage of the son of the petitioner no. 1 was solemnized with the daughter of the informant on 02.12.2022. After the marriage, the petitioners, along with other co-accused persons, started demanding colour television, gold chain, cot (diwan palang), cooler, freeze



and Rs. 1,00,000/- in cash by the informant's daughter, upon which the informant's daughter used to say that whenever her parents will have the money, they will arrange the same. The petitioners used to threaten the informant's daughter that if she will not give the articles, they will kill her. A week prior to the present occurrence, the accused persons had administered poison to the informant's daughter and when the informant got this information, he took his daughter for treatment. On 12.06.2025, at about 05:30 AM, when the informant went to the matrimonial home of his daughter, he saw the dead body of his daughter, having injuries on her face and body and also found burn injuries on her dead body.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case with ulterior motive. He further submits that the petitioner no. 1 is the mother-in-law of the deceased and the petitioner no. 2 is the devar of the deceased. He further submits that the informant's daughter was under treatment and the informant's daughter was treated by doctors at Dr. H. N. Ray Clinic, on 12.06.2025, in which the EEG and Brain Mapping analysis of the informant's



daughter was done and during treatment, the victim died. The EEG and brain mapping report has been annexed by the petitioners at as Annexure P/2. He further submits that there is no eye-witness to the occurrence and in the post-mortem examination report, the doctor has opined that the death is due to cardiac arrest (Asyslol) with trauma vitac organs and painful stimuli.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor and learned Counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for bail. Learned Counsel for the informant submits that within three years of the marriage, the deceased was killed by the accused persons for demand of dowry. He further submits that from perusal of the case diary, it would be evident that the inquest of the dead body of the deceased was done on 12.06.2025, at 09:55 AM; whereas from the EEG and Brain Mapping analysis report of the doctors at Dr. H. N. Ray Clinic (Annexure P/2), shows that the said test was done on 12.06.2025, at 15:33:10 (i.e., 03:33 PM), which is not possible. The petitioners have not come to this Court with clean hands and they have annexed a forged report to show that the deceased died in normal circumstances. He



further submits that from the post-mortem examination report, conducted on the dead body of the deceased at 05:05 PM, which was brought at 03:50 PM, the doctor has found the external injuries as follows:

“External appearance: Multiple abrasion of about 2” x-3” x 2” x 3” over the left wrist. Multiple burn over the left hand of about 1” x 1/2”, swelling of left thumb with scald. Multiple Bruise over the left forearm and Arm of 1” x 1/2”.

Bruise of 1” x band over the right wrist. Burn of 1” x 1/2” over the right thumb and dorsum of right Abrasion of 1” x 1/2” over the nose.”

6. Learned Counsel for the informant further submits that the post-mortem examination report corroborates the allegation made by the informant in the First Information Report. This is a heinous offence and the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.
7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the materials on record including the case diary.
8. Within three years of the marriage, the informant's daughter died an unnatural death in her matrimonial home. The nature of death is not important whether it is homicidal, suicidal or accidental but the fact of the matter is that deceased died an unnatural death within three years



of her marriage. There is a presumption against the accused persons under Section 113(A) and 113(B) of the Evidence Act. The offence is serious in nature and the punishment thereof is also serious. Further, the defence taken by the petitioners, i.e. Annexure P/2, appears to be a fake document inasmuch as the said report was prepared on 12.06.2025, at 03:33 PM; whereas it is alleged in the First Information Report that the deceased was found dead in her matrimonial home in the morning of 12.06.2025 and the inquest was done by the police on the dead body of the deceased on 12.06.2025, at 09:55 AM, the dead body of the deceased was brought on 12.06.2025 at 03:50 PM and the post-mortem was conducted on 12.06.2025 itself at 05:05 PM. Apart from this, the doctor has found burn injury and other injuries on the dead body of the deceased.

9. Accordingly, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.
10. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	✓	T	✓
---	---	---	---

