

**IN THE COURT OF
DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I
MUNGER, BIHAR**

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 696 of 2026

Soni Kumari and Others Vs State of Bihar

Muffasil P.S. Case No. 167 of 2024

Order dated: 19.06.2026

ORDER

19.06.2026

The present Anticipatory Bail Application has been preferred by Petitioners namely **(1) Soni Kumari @ Soni Devi** w/o Chhotu Mandal **(2) Priyanka Kumari @ Priyanka Devi** w/o Rupesh Mandal **(3) Chhotu Mandal** s/o Jyotish Mandal **(4) Rupesh Mandal** s/o Jyotish Mandal and **(5) Jyotish Mandal** s/o Late Singheshwar Mandal who are apprehension of arrest in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 167 of 2024 under Sections 304(B), 120(B) & 201/34 of IPC, under Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act and under Section 27 of Arms Act pending in the Court of Ld. S.D.J.M., Munger. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners' is present on calling and Learned Additional Public Prosecutor on behalf of the State as well as Ld. Informant's Counsel is also present.

As per the Bail Application, it is submitted that the Petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence and falsely implicated due to family dispute in this case. He further submits that the alleged occurrence is said to have occurred on 05.01.2022 and FIR was registered on 07.05.2024 on the basis of complaint after two years of alleged occurred which speaks volume against the prosecution case. That during investigation it has come that the deceased fallen from roof which caused injury to deceased and on the way of hospital deceased died and in investigation I.O. did not found any allegation of demand of dowry and hands of Petitioner. The witnesses stated in case diary that funeral was done in presence of deceased's father, mother and in-laws members and concealing these fact filed this present case with a story to burn the deceased with ulterior motive. After two years of alleged incident, informant lodged this case under influence of others as the deceased died naturally due to fall from roof. The Petitioner has no hand in the alleged incident but his name has been

**IN THE COURT OF
DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I
MUNGER, BIHAR**

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 696 of 2026

Soni Kumari and Others Vs State of Bihar

Muffasil P.S. Case No. 167 of 2024

Order dated: 19.06.2026

introduced in this false case by giving a colour of criminal offence. In para-2 of the Application, it is certified that the Petitioners have not previously filed any Bail Application before this Court or before Hon'ble High Court of Patna except on ABA No. 808 of 2025 of Petitioner No. 2 to 4 which was already rejected by this Court. The Petitioners have no criminal antecedent. The Petitioners are ready to furnish the bail bond and they are also ready to comply with direction of this Court. Hence, it is prayed to enlarge the Petitioners on Anticipatory Bail.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor on behalf of the State vehemently opposed the present Anticipatory Bail Application.

As per the written statement of the prosecution story is that it was alleged by the informant namely Meera Devi alleged that her daughter namely Madhu Kumari who was married with Nitish Kumar on 03.06.2020. She gave him Rs. 51,000/- (Fifty One Thousand Rupees), three gram gold jewellery and twenty gram silver jewellery and one glamour motorcycle etc. After marriage her daughter give birth a male child namely Ansh Kumar. After sometime of marriage all the above named accused are demanding dowry from the Informant. On 30.01.2022, the Informant and her husband with her son went to the house of the Petitioners and gave them thirty five thousand rupees during that Jyotish Mandal told them it not sufficient money, they demanded more and if not fulfill the demand they threatened to burn their daughter. The Informant futher alleged that on the eve of holi in year 2022 went to the Petitioners house, the co-accused Kalawati Devi told them no body here, they went to Shalimar in Delhi. After that, the Informant's son went delhi to meet his sister but he could not meet there. The informant further went to the Petitioners house to enquire her daughter then the petitioner namely Kishor Mandal told your daughter and son-in-law went to Kolkata for treatment. After some time they were doubted about her daughter and the Informant and her relative went to the Petitioners house but there locked

**IN THE COURT OF
DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I
MUNGER, BIHAR**

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 696 of 2026

Soni Kumari and Others Vs State of Bihar

Muffasil P.S. Case No. 167 of 2024

Order dated: 19.06.2026

up the house, they thought her daughter was murdered by accused persons due to dowry demand. The Informant and her husband and other relatives went to the near police station and registered FIR against the the Petitioners and other co-accused persons.

Heard both sides and perused the records.

From the perusal of the case record, it is clear that the Petitioners is named in FIR along with others and there is direct allegation against them to torture the deceased before her death in respect of demand of dowry which resulted into her death in suspicious condition. The Petitioners are family member of main accused in this case who is husband of the deceased. All prosecution witnesses in paras-4 & 6 of the case diary have supported the case of prosecution. Paras-37, 38 & 39 of the case diary contained information regarding medical treatment of deceased in PHC, Munger and Sadar Hospital, Munger. Para-42, 43, 44 & 45 of the case diary contained statements of witnesses who have stated contradictory statement regarding prosecution case. Case diary does not contain any treatment slip, injury report or post-mortem report of deceased. The concerned Investigating Officer after completion of investigation has submitted charge-sheet under Section 304(B) of IPC against the Petitioner and non sent-up against rest accused persons. The court below has taken cognizance under Sections 304(B), 120(B) & 201/34 of IPC, under Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act and under Section 27 of Arms Act on 28.03.2026.

Therefore, considering aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as discussed above, nature of the allegation, present status of this case, nature of injury, no criminal antecedent as per bail application, rejecting of bail of co-accused persons by this Court, close relation between both sides, submission of charge-sheet as well as taking of cognizance against accused persons including petitioners, I am of the view that there is direct allegation

**IN THE COURT OF
DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I
MUNGER, BIHAR**

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 696 of 2026

Soni Kumari and Others Vs State of Bihar

Muffasil P.S. Case No. 167 of 2024

Order dated: 19.06.2026

against the Petitioners which is serious in nature and the Petitioners are family members of main accused person who is also husband of deceased and this case is related to death of victim in respect of non-fulfillment of dowry demand. Hence, the Petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the prayer of bail of the Petitioners **(1) Soni Kumari @ Soni Devi (2) Priyanka Kumari @ Priyanka Devi (3) Chhotu Mandal (4) Rupesh Mandal and (5) Jyotish Mandal** is hereby Rejected.

Dictated,

Sd/-

District & Addl. Sessions Judge-I, Munger

Dated: 19.06.2026

Date of Order/Judgement	19.06.2026
Uploading Date	25.06.2026
Uploaded By	Neeraj Kumar Pandey (Steno)