

In the court of Additional sessions Judge-II

A.B.P. No – 2068 of 2026 and 2079 of 2026.

(Arising out of Ramkrishna Nagar PS Case no – 166 of 2026.)

Kumari Sarika & others

Petitioners.

Vs.

The State of Bihar

Opposite party

Sr. No.	Date	Order with signature of the Court	Office Action/ s taken with Date
16.06.26		Two separate anticipatory bail petitions filed on behalf of accused accused 1. Kumari Sarika, Female, aged about 40 years, D/o Anant Kumar, R/o Awesome Garment, Amardip Nagar, Jyotish Path, South Ramkrishna Nagar, New Jaganpura, Dist. Patna 2. Avinash Kumar, aged about 39 years, S/o Lt. Rajballabh Prasad, R/o Awesome Garments, Sarswati Path, Jyotish Path, Amardeep Nagar, Kankarbagh, Dist.-Patna 3. Dayamanti Kumar, aged about 73 years, W/o LT. Rajballabh Prasad, R/o Drawan, PO-Chandradeep, Pakribarawan, Nawada, 4. Rinki Kumari, aged about 34 years, W/o Mrityunjay Kumar, R/o Village-Drawan, PS-Kawakol, PO-Chandradeep, Pakri Barwan, Nawada in connection with Ramkrishna Nagar P.S. case no – 166 of 2026 for the offence U/S 85, 351(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of the BNS and Prevention of Dowry Act (3,4). On request of Ld. Counsel for the petitioners both the petitions heard together. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned Addl. P.P. for the state and perused the case-diary. The prosecution case as per written application submitted by the informant namely Anuradha Kumari before the S.H.O. Ramkrishna Nagar P.S., in brief, is that on the alleged complaint on 17.02.2026 regarding the husband's illicit relationship with another woman (petitioner), demand for dowry and physical & mental harassment. She further alleged that marriage took place in 2022 according to Hindu rituals. After marriage, the husband began neglecting the complainant and maintained an illegal relationship with Kumari Sarika. Complainant alleges continuous physical and mental abuse by her husband, mother – in – law and sister-in-law over a demand for Rs. 15 lakhs cash and a four-wheeler car. Husband and his family regularly give life threats to the complainant and her family, stating they will completely destroy them. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners have submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely implicated by the informant and there are no specific allegations incorporated in the FIR are vague, omnibus, and generalized and lacks any specific details or particular instance of the alleged harassment. Petitioner no. 1 is a legitimate business associate of the husband of the informant and their relationship is strictly limited to commercial operations at the factory premises mentioned in the FIR and has no role in the domestic affairs in the informant. Petitioner no. 3 & 4 have been arrayed in the present case only for unleashing personal vendetta and settling personal score as they are the family members of husband of the informant. In which compromised petition filed by the petitioners that husband and informant have mutually and amicably decided to settle all their disputes and differences arising out of their matrimonial relationship between them. Informant appeared to the court and support compromise petition and also said that no objection to grant this bail. The petitioners have got no criminal antecedent. Hence the petitioners deserve to be released on bail.	

In the court of Additional sessions Judge-II

A.B.P. No – 2068 of 2026 and 2079 of 2026.

(Arising out of Ramkrishna Nagar PS Case no – 166 of 2026.)

Kumari Sarika & others

Petitioners.

Vs.

The State of Bihar

Opposite party

Cont....
16.06.26

On the other hand learned Addl. P.P. opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner contending that investigation against the petitioners is still continuing.

Heard both sides, perused the record and other materials available on the record. From perusal of the same, it transpires that there is no specific allegation of any overt act against the petitioners, rather allegation is general and omnibus in nature. The informant appeared before the court and supported the factum of compromise with the petitioners. No custodial interrogation is required in this case. The petitioners have got no criminal antecedent vide Para-4 of the bail petitions.

Having considered the above facts and circumstances as well as the material available in the case record as well as in the view of the argument advanced by the learned counsel for petitioners I am inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail. In event of arrest or surrender of the petitioners within six weeks from the date of receipt the copy of order, let the petitioner as above noted be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/ with two sureties like amount each to the satisfaction of Sri Subhash Chandra Nishad, Ld. JMFC, Patna under subject to the condition as laid down under section 482(2) of B.N.S.S. 2023.

Dictated,

Sd/-

Addl. Sessions Judge-II, Patna.

16.06.2026.

Date of Judgment/Order	16-06-2026
Date of Reserving Judgment/Order	16-06-2026
Uploading Date	16-06-2026
Uploaded by	Niranjan Kumar Ojha