

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT ADDITIONAL & SESSIONS JUDGE-II,
AURANGABAD

A.B.P No. 1616/2026

Arising out of Aurangabad Mahila P.S. Case No. 33/2024

Present:- Anindita Singh, Additional Sessions Judge-II,
Aurangabad (Bihar)

1. Bhagirathi Devi.

2. Pramod Ram.

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

The State of Bihar

...Opposite Party(s)

Appearance :

For the Petitioner(s)

:

Sri Sanjay Kumar, Adv

For the State

:

Sri Anil Kumar-II Ld. A.P.P

24.07.2026

An application for anticipatory bail filed on behalf of above named petitioners who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Aurangabad Mahila P.S. Case No. 33/2024 instituted for the offence u/s 341, 323, 498(A), 504, 506/34 IPC & 3/4 Dowry Prohibition Act has been pressed today for hearing.

Heard Ld. Counsel of the petitioners as well as Ld. APP.

One Seema Devi is the informant of the case who has filed a written report in Aurangabad Mahila PS alleging therein that she was married on 26.5.2023 with one Premchand Kumar and started living at her matrimonial house. On 3.5.24 at 12:00 noon her husband, parents-in-law, sister-in-law, Bhainsur all started assaulting her by fists and slaps by saying that their demand of Rs. 1 lakh has not been fulfilled by her. Due to assault the informant has sustained internal injury. Anyhow she saved herself by fleeing from there.

It is the submission of the Ld. counsel on behalf of petitioners that the petitioners are entirely innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioners are parents-in-law of the informant and they have neither demanded any dowry from her nor tortured her ever. As a matter of fact the petitioners live separate from their son and they have no

concern of the daily affairs of their son & daughter-in-law. The present petitioners have also clean criminal antecedent and the investigation of the case has already been completed. Accordingly, prayer has been made to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail .

Per contra, the learned A.P.P. for the State opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, however conceded the fact fairly that at present the investigation has already been completed and during investigation the petitioners have enjoyed privilege of section 41(A) Cr.PC.

Heard and perused the case record as well as the TCR which has been already received. All the present petitioners are named in the FIR and are the parents-in-law of the informant. The thrust of allegation against the present petitioners is of demanding Rs. 1 lakh from the informant and assaulting her on account of non-fulfillment of their illegal demand. However, LCR shows that at present investigation of the case has already been completed. Further para 32 of the case diary reveals that the present petitioners have been released on bond during investigation by the IO. The petitioners have been not arrested during the investigation and have fully co-operated in it. At present after cognizance summon and bailable warrant have been issued against these petitioners. Para no. 22 of the case diary also shows that there is no criminal antecedent of the present petitioners who are parent-in-law of the informant.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I find it judicious to extend the privilege of pre-arrest bail to the accused petitioners. Accordingly, they, in the event of their arrest/surrender in the Court within four weeks from the date of the receipt of copy of this order, are directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 20,000 with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned concerned court subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

Sd/-

*(Anindita Singh)
Addl. Sessions Judge -II*