

**IN THE COURT OF II<sup>nd</sup> ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, BHOJPUR AT ARA**  
**Ramesh Chaudhary & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar**  
**A.B.P. No.-628 of 2026**  
**Jagdishpur P. S. Case No. 387/2024**  
**U/ss -498(A) IPC & 3/4 D.P. Act.**

Ser ial no.	Date of Order of proceeding	Order with signature of the Court	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4

	<b><u>23-03-2026</u></b>	<p>The present petition for anticipatory bail has been filed on behalf of accused/petitioners namely 1. Ramesh Chaudhary @ Ramesh Nath Choudhary 2. Gudia Kumari @ Neelam Kumari 3. Kusum Devi 4. Pinki Kumari 5. Gautam Kumar @ Rohit apprehending their arrest in connection with the present case.</p> <p>The prosecution case in brief is that the informant Shobha Devi gave typed application to the officer in-charge of Jagdishpur Police Station stating therein that her daughter Sanju Kumari was married with Satish Kumar @ Kunal on 07.12.2022 as per Hindu rites and customs. Her daughter went to her sasural on 08.12.2022 and lived in her sasural comfortably for six month. Thereafter her-in-laws started demanding Rs. 5,00,000/- and a four wheeler vehicle. When her daughter expressed inability of her parents to meet their demands thereafter husband, in-laws of her daughter started torturing her mentally and physically. Her son-in-law Santosh Kumar abused and committed mar-peat with her daughter and also made allegations regarding her character. Her daughter's mother-in-law Kusum Devi, father-in-law Ramesh Chaudhary, sister-in-laws Gudia Kumari and Pinki Kumari, brother-in-law Gautam Kumar harassed and tortured her and also committed mar-peat with her. These persons were forcing her to commit suicide. On 10.03.2024, her daughter informed her in this regard. Thereafter her son Deepak Kumar went to the matrimonial house of her daughter on 11.03.2024 and saw her in bad condition and brought her back to her parental house. There were injury marks on the body of her daughter. She gave an application in Mahila Police Station Ara on 01.06.2023 at that time her husband was alive. The father-in-law of her daughter came and said that they would not repeat the mistake and took back her daughter to her matrimonial house. Her daughter is staying in her parental house and her-in-laws are not willing to pay her back to her matrimonial house and they are also demanding dowry.</p> <p>Learned counsel for petitioners submitted that petitioners are innocent persons and have committed no offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. No such occurrence as alleged by the informant did ever take place. No dowry was ever demanded either from the Sanju Devi or her parents nor was she ever tortured for dowry. The petitioners are in laws of the alleged victim Sanju Devi and the allegations made against the petitioners are not specific rather allegations are general in nature. The petitioners have no criminal</p>	
--	--------------------------	--	--

**IN THE COURT OF II<sup>nd</sup> ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, BHOJPUR AT ARA**  
**Ramesh Chaudhary & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar**  
**A.B.P. No.-628 of 2026**  
**Jagdishpur P. S. Case No. 387/2024**  
**U/ss -498(A) IPC & 3/4 D.P. Act.**

Ser ial no.	Date of Order of proceeding	Order with signature of the Court	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4

	<p><b><u>Conti.....</u></b>  <b>23-03-2026</b></p>	<p>antecedent.</p> <p>Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail.</p> <p>Arguments heard and record perused.</p> <p>From the perusal of the record, it transpires that the allegation against the petitioners are that they assaulted and tortured the informant's daughter in connection with their demand of dowry. This case has been pending since 25.02.2026. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has not filed the case diary till date. The petitioners are in-laws and the allegations against them are general in nature.</p> <p>Therefore, keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned court below within one month from today upon furnishing bail bonds to the tune of Rs. 10,000/- with two sureties of the like amount each subject to the satisfaction of court concerned. The anticipatory bail petition is accordingly <b>allowed</b>.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Dictated</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(Sudhakar Pandey)</b>  II<sup>nd</sup> Addl. Sessions Judge  Bhojpur at Ara  23.03.2026</p>	
--	--	---	--