

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE,
KAIMUR AT BHABHUA
(ABP No. 551/2026/ Filing No. 2376/2026)**

In re:

1. Ghanshyam Kumar Dubey, aged 40 years,
S/o Late Ram Kumar Dubey,
R/o Vill-Lalapur, Kudra Ward No.2, P.S.-Kudra, Dist-Kaimur (Bhabhua)

V/s
STATE

FIR No: 433/2025
P.S : Kudra
U/s: 80,61(2),191(2),115(2),352,
351(2) BNS
Date Of Order:30.04.2026

-
1. Heard Sri Ritesh Kumar Pathak, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused/ petitioner and Sh. Sachidanand Rai, learned P.P. for State.
 2. Petitioner has stated in para 2 of their bail petition that no other bail petition, either anticipatory or regular has been filed/pending except this, either in this court or before Hon'ble High Court at Patna.
 3. Alleging false implication of the petitioner, it is submitted on his behalf that in fact the deceased has already obtained the decree of divorce and separated from his life and thereafter married with the owner brother of the petitioner and the petitioner has been falsely implicated at the instance of his brother who is adamant to grab the house constructed by the petitioner from his own fund, in the name of his mother who transferred the said house to the petitioner through will, however, there is no material on record which shows that the petitioner has ever put the deceased to cruelty or torture. Whereas none has seen the petitioner committing the alleged occurrence and as such it is submitted that the petitioner is innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case.
 4. Learned PP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
 5. Heard the arguments of both the parties and perused the case record. It transpires from the perusal of record that petitioner is FIR named and allegations against him

as per FIR are that this petitioner got married to the daughter of informant in the year 2017 and after marriage, he along with his family members started torturing the daughter of informant for dowry demands and finally on dated 05.12.2025, he came to know that his daughter was killed by this petitioner and his family members and thereafter, hanged her. The post mortem report of the deceased is mentioned in para 18 of case diary showing cause of death is due to smothering and throttling. It is submitted on behalf of prosecution that this petitioner is the husband of deceased and there is specific allegation against him of killing his wife by throttling and investigation against this petitioner is still pending.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to give him the benefit of anticipatory bail. Hence, this anticipatory bail petition is **dismissed**. (Dictated)

Sd/- Anurag
Sessions Judge