

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYAJI
A.B. P. No. - 1504/2026
Anirudh Kumar @ Anirudh Sharma Vrs. State of Bihar
Mau P.S Case No.35/2026

06.05.2026

Present:

For the petitioner -----: Sri Rahul Kumar, Advocate

For the State-----: Sri S.B. Ojha, Public Prosecutor

The present petition for anticipatory bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioner Anirudh Kumar @ Anirudh Sharma who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Mau P. S. Case No. 35/2026 registered for the offences punishable under sections 80, 238, 3(5) of the BNS.

Prosecution case, in brief, as per written report of the informant Rakesh Kumar is that the marriage of his daughter was solemnized on 21.04.2024 as per Hindu rites and rituals with Priyaranjan Kumar @ Sanu Kumar and at the time of marriage jewellery, cash and other household articles worth Rs.15,00,000/- were given. It is further alleged that after some time of marriage, the accused/petitioner and his family members started demanding Rs.5,00,000/- additional dowry and due to non-fulfillment, the accused persons started torturing the informant's daughter physically and mentally and further threatened to face dire consequences. On 11.03.2026 at about 7:45 P.M., the informant contacted his daughter on mobile phone and that time she did not complain anything ill. It is further alleged that on 12.03.2026, some other person informed that his daughter has been killed and her body has been cremated. It is further alleged that he has apprehension that her daughter has been killed by the accused/petitioner and his family members.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that no occurrence as alleged has ever took place as a matter of fact the informant has lodged this false case and made accused to this petitioner. He also submits that petitioner is father-in-law of the deceased and from the facts and circumstances it is crystal clear that petitioner has played no role in the alleged occurrence but has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that there is no specific allegation against him and as such he deserves the privilege of anticipatory bail.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYAJI
A.B. P. No. - 1504/2026
Anirudh Kumar @ Anirudh Sharma Vrs. State of Bihar
Mau P.S Case No.35/2026

Ld. P. P. vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

I have considered the submissions as advanced by the parties and have perused the case record as well as case diary. The case has been registered for the offence under Sections 80, 238, 3(5) of the BNS. As per the FIR, the allegation against the accused/petitioner is that he including his family members have killed the informant's daughter due to non-fulfillment of additional dowry and cremated her dead body without informing the informant which appears to be very serious in nature. As per para-59 of case dairy, the allegation has been found to be true against this petitioner. The investigation in this case is is still going on. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and heinous nature of the alleged offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated and corrected)

Sd/-
(P.K. Malik)
Sessions Judge, Gayaji
06.05.2026

Date of Judgment/Order	06.05.2026
Date of reserving Judgment/Order	N/A
Uploading Date	13.05.2026
Uploaded by	Steno (Vikash Kumar)