

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, BANKA**

*Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 41 of 2026*

*Date of filing : 08.01.2026*

*Date of order : 25.03.2026*

---

*1. Neha Panjekar, wife of late Anuj Panjekar, aged about 27 years, resident of village-Kaitha, P.S.-Shambhuganj, District-Banka*

*2. Aadarsh Pratab, aged about 29 years, son of Kailash Prasad, resident of village-Karsop, P.S.-Shambhuganj, District-Banka*

*..... Petitioners*

*-Versus-*

*1. State of Bihar*

*.....Opposite Party*

---

*Present : - Sri Uday Mukharjee, Advocate for the Petitioners*

*Sri Hira Lal Singh, Public Prosecutor for the State*

---

**ORDER**

*1. Apprehending arrest the petitioners have preferred this pre-arrest bail application who are booked in Shambhuganj Police Station Case No. 334 of 2025 for the offence allegedly committed under Section 108, 3/5 of BNSS.*

*2. The case of prosecution is engendered upon an application filed by one Manju Devi, with the allegations that her son Anuj Panjekar married with Neha Panjekar in the year 2013. He was working in Gujrat. Since the marriage her daughter-in-law along with her children was living in his house in village Kaitha and his son was living in Gujrat for his livelihood. Her daughter-in-law used to go Shambhuganj Bazar and there she fell into love affair with Adarsh Pratap son of Kailash Sah. She along with both children used to live with Adarsh Pratap. When Anuj came to know this, he came there and squabble took place. The accused persons threatened him of dire consequences. His son could not bear this tension and, ultimately, on 25.12.2025, he died.*

*3. In oral arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that*

*the petitioner no. 1/wife was already victim of cruelty by her husband Anuj. Therefore, she not only sent legal notice to him but also reported the matter to the SHO, Shambhuganj on 08.12.2025 itself.*

*4. In counter, learned counsel for the complainant/informant stoutly opposed the bail application.*

*5. Heard rival submissions and perused the record. Without anything commenting on merits of the case, there are serious allegations against the present petitioners and the opinion of cause of death has yet not been given by the doctor. Keeping in view the above and that the case still at nascent stage of investigation, this court does not find the case fit for pre-arrest bail at this stage; resultantly, it is dismissed.*

*6. File be consigned to the record room and that of trial court be sent back with a copy of this order.*

*7. Keeping in view the General Order no. 1 of 1991 (Criminal) dated 07.03.1991, the certified copy of FIR, if desired, be returned back to the petitioners on placing the xerox copy thereof on record.*

*(Dictated)*

*(Satya Bhushan Arya)  
Sessions Judge, Banka  
25.03.2026*