

KANHAIYA JEE CHOUDHARY
Sessions Judge, Purnea.
ABP No.341 of 2026/CIS No.341 of 2026
Sumitra Devi Versus State
(arising out of Sadar P.S. Case No.574 of 2025)
Date of Order : 19.3.2026.

COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE, PURNEA

Anticipatory Bail Petition No.341 of 2026
Sumitra Devi W/o Late Basant Sahni, R/o Gulabbag, Lakripatti, P.S. Sadar, District
Purnea. At present R/o Rajhat, Gayatri Nagar, Ward No.17, P.S. Banmankhi,
District Purnea. .. Petitioner.

Versus

State of Bihar

.. Opp. Party

Date of order or proceeding	Order with signature of the court	Office action taken with date
19.3.2026	1. Anticipatory Bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioner, namely, Sumitra Devi, who is apprehending her arrest in connection with Sadar P.S. Case No.574 of 2025 registered for the offence under sections 80,3(5) of the BNS is put-up for hearing. 2. Heard Sri Manoj Kumar Singh, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioners and Sri A.K.Tiwary, the learned P.P. for the state. 3. As per written report of the Informant, the prosecution case, in brief, is that his second sister, namely, Neha Kumari (deceased) was married with Rambali Sahni according to Hindu rites and ritual three years ago. After some days of marriage of his said sister, the in-laws named in the FIR including these petitioners being Gotni and niece respectively in furtherance of their common intention of all started torturing her mentally and physically in so many ways for fulfillment of dowry demand. On 16.11.2025 at about 11 A.M., Informant came to know that all the FIR named accused persons including this petitioner being mother-in-law of the deceased in furtherance of their common intention of all committed murder of his sister Neha Kumari and hanged her dead body to give a colour for committing suicide by the deceased. 4. Learned counsel for petitioner submitted that	

Contd. 19.3.2026	petitioner is lady and she is mother-in-law of the deceased. Petitioner is senior citizen and there is no legal evidence in the whole of the case diary to connect the petitioner regarding involvement in the alleged occurrence. He also submitted that as a matter of fact, deceased died in her matrimonial house by committing suicide due to dispute between deceased and her husband and Informant taking the advantage of aforesaid occurrence, implicated the petitioner by concocting a false story only and there is no specific overt-act against them. Petitioner is a senior citizen women of clean antecedent and there is no chance of her absconding. In addition to that co-accused persons have already been granted anticipatory bail by this court vide order dated 29.1.2026 passed in ABP No.36 of 2026 and case of this petitioner stands more or less similar footing. So, prayed for anticipatory bail. 5. On the contrary learned P.P. I/c though opposed the anticipatory bail petition of petitioner but conceded the fact that petitioner is mother-in-law of the deceased and on similar situated fact, co-accused persons have already been allowed anticipatory bail by this court. 6. I have heard rival submissions of both the parties and perused the case record and case diary. It appears that it is a case of dowry death and petitioner being mother-in-law of the deceased named in the FIR with allegation that all the FIR named accused persons including this petitioner in furtherance of their common intention of all committed murder of the deceased for non-fulfillment of dowry demand and hanged her dead body to give a colour of suicide. The aforesaid FIR is contradictory to the statement of the witnesses recorded by the Police during the course of investigation relating to the petitioner. From perusal of post	
---------------------	---	--

Contd. 19.3.2026	mortem report of the deceased, it appears that admittedly, the death of deceased Neha Kumari died is unnatural but there is no specific overt-act against this petitioner and statement of the witnesses recorded during the course of investigation are contradictory relating to act of this petitioner. Petitioner is senior citizen women and on similar situated fact, co-accused persons have already been allowed anticipatory bail by this court vide aforesaid order. 7. Considering the fact and circumstances discussed above,petitioner is lady and senior citizen and mother-in-law of the deceased but there is contradictory statement of the witnesses recorded during the course of investigation regarding involvement of this petitioner and there is no specific overt-act against her and petitioner is women of clean antecedent, so, anticipatory bail petition of petitioner, namely,Sumitra Devi is allowed and it is ordered that in the event of their arrest/surrender, they will be enlarged on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail-bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below within fortnight from the receipt of this order subject to the conditions as laid down u/s 482 BNSS. (Dictated & corrected by me) Sd/- Sessions Judge,Purnea. <table><tr><td>Date of Order</td><td>19.3.2026</td></tr><tr><td>Date of Reserving Judgment/ order</td><td>19.3.2026</td></tr><tr><td>Uploading Date</td><td>24.3.2026.</td></tr><tr><td>Uploaded by</td><td>Kumar Sanjay,Steno</td></tr></table>	Date of Order	19.3.2026	Date of Reserving Judgment/ order	19.3.2026	Uploading Date	24.3.2026.	Uploaded by	Kumar Sanjay,Steno
Date of Order	19.3.2026								
Date of Reserving Judgment/ order	19.3.2026								
Uploading Date	24.3.2026.								
Uploaded by	Kumar Sanjay,Steno								