
In the Court of Sessions Judge, East Champaran at Motihari.

Present:-

Abhishek Kumar Das
Sessions Judge,
East Champaran, Motihari

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 1384 of 2026

- 1. Raju Mahto, aged about 55 years, S/o- Jagrup Mahto.**
 - 2. Shivkanti Devi, aged about 52 years, W/o Raju Mahto.**
- Both resident of village- Sukhlahiya P.S. Darpa, District- East Champaran.
----- **Petitioners.**

Versus

The State of Bihar ----- **Opposite party.**

Counsel for the Petitioners :- Sri Md. Imteyazul Haque, Advocate.
Counsel for the State :- Sri Khublal Prasad, Public Prosecutor.
Counsel for the Informant :- Sri Md. Ali, Advocate.

16.04.2026

This is an anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioners, namely, (1) **Raju Mahto** and (2) **Shivkanti Devi**, who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Darpa P.S. Case No. 07 of 2026 for the offences u/ss 103(1), 80(2), 238, 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

In para-2 of the anticipatory bail petition, it is mentioned that no other anticipatory or regular bail petition has ever been filed on behalf of the petitioners either in this Court or before the Hon'ble Patna High Court. In para-3 of the anticipatory bail petition, it is mentioned that the petitioners have no criminal antecedent.

The prosecution case, in brief, is that the informant's daughter Anu Kumari (deceased) was married with Sonu Kumar on 10.12.2025 according to Hindu rites & rituals. After marriage, Raju Mahto and Shivkanti Devi (petitioners) alongwith other co-accused persons i.e. her in-laws started torturing and threatening to kill the informant's daughter for demand of a bullet motorcycle in dowry. On 14.01.2026 at around 04:30 hrs., the informant was told by the villagers that his daughter has been killed by beating and strangulating her neck by her in-laws and they have hidden the evidence somewhere. After receiving this information, when the informant reached at her daughter's in-laws house in Village-Sukhlahiya, he found that they have fled away from there and on further inquiry he didn't found anything.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent, they have committed no offence, as alleged, and have falsely been implicated in

16.04.2026
continued....

this case. The petitioners have neither demanded dowry nor has tortured and have caused death of the alleged victim. The petitioners are father-in-law and mother-in-law of the deceased.

The learned Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

Heard both sides and perused the record. From perusal of record, it transpires that the petitioners are named in the F.I.R. As per F.I.R., the petitioners alongwith other co-accused persons have committed murder of the informant's daughter and hidden the evidence somewhere. Further, it also transpires that prior to the death of deceased, she has informed her father/informant that her in-laws were making plan to kill her if she fails to fulfil the demand of dowry. As per para- 3, 8, 9, 10, & 11 of the case diary, the informant in his restatement and the witnesses in their statement corroborated the version of the F.I.R. and supported the prosecution story. As per para-14 of the case diary, police recovered suspected human (female) burnt bones remains and the same was sent to F.S.L for examination. As per para-3 of this anticipatory bail petition and para-65 of the case diary, the petitioners have no any criminal antecedent. As per para-66 of the case diary, the investigation is under progress.

In the facts of the case and keeping in view the nature of allegation, gravity of offence and materials available in the case diary as well as ongoing status of investigation, I am not inclined to give privilege of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioners, namely, **(1) Raju Mahto** and **(2) Shivkanti Devi** stands **rejected**.

(Dictated)

sd/-

Sessions Judge
East Champaran, Motihari
16.04.2026