

IN THE COURT OF ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-04, DANAPUR

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 53 of 2026 (Sigori P.S. case No. 165/2025)

In The Matter of:-

- 1. Manish Kumar, aged about 26 years, s/o Chandeshwar Yadav @ Chandeshwar Singh,**
- 2. Arti Kumari, aged about 20 years, d/o Chandeshwar Yadav @ Chandeshwar Singh,**
- 3. Pappu Yadav @ Pappu Rai, aged about 30 years, s/o Chandeshwar Yadav @ Chandeshwar Singh,**
- 4. Chandeshwar Yadav @ Chandeshwar Singh, aged about 64 years, s/o Late Nathuna Singh,**
- 5. Ramuniya Devi, aged about 62 years, w/o Chandeshwar Yadav @ Chandeshwar Singh, all are resident of Vill. Gowari (Ugwari), P.S. Sigori, Distt. Patna.**
..... Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Bihar.....O.P No. 01

Priyaranjan Kumar, s/o Durga Yadav..... O.P. No. 02

Lawyer for the accused; Sri Ajay Kumar (Adv.)

Lawyer for the State; Sri Kalam Ansari, Addl. P.P. and Sri Vinay Kumar (Adv.) for the O.P. No.2

Present: - Naghma Tarannum, Addl. Sessions Judge-04, Danapur

ORDER

28.03.2026	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The present bail petition dated 06.01.2026 has been filed under Sections 482 of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) on behalf of the above-named accused petitioners, apprehending their arrest in connection with Sigori P.S. Case No. 165 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 190, and 80(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS). The matter is placed today for order.2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant. Perused the case diary and the materials available on record.3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the sister of the informant, namely Pooja Kumari, was married to co-accused Vikas Kumar in the year 2021 and was allegedly subjected to cruelty on account of demand of dowry soon after her marriage. She was forced to leave her matrimonial home and has been living with her parents for the six months. She was taken to her matrimonial home again by the accused petitioner Chandeshwar Yadav on 01.11.2025, but on 05.11.2025 the co-accused Arti Kumari informed the informant that, his sister has got seriously ill and has been admitted to PMCH. Upon the said	Contd.
------------	--	--------

<p>Contd. 28.03.2026</p>	<p>information when the informant went to the PMCH he found his sister dead there and was told that, she has been died due to consumption of poison, giving rise to suspicion of homicidal death on account of dowry demand. On the basis of the fard bayan of the informant, the present case has been instituted against six accused persons including these petitioners.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case merely on account of their relationship with the husband of the deceased. It is contended that the petitioners, being mother-in-law, father-in-law, brother-in-law and sister-in-law of the deceased, were living separately and had no concern with the day-to-day matrimonial affairs of the deceased. It is further argued that there is no specific allegation of demand of dowry or cruelty against these petitioners and the allegations are general and omnibus in nature. It has also been submitted that the ingredients of Section 80(2) of the BNS are not prima facie made out against these petitioners. The petitioners are stated to have clean antecedents and are ready to abide by every direction of the Court.</p> <p>5. Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, assisted by the learned counsel for the informant, has opposed the prayer for bail, submitting that the allegations relate to a dowry death occurring within a short span of marriage under suspicious circumstances. It is argued that the nature of the offence is grave and serious, and at this stage, the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of bail.</p> <p>6. Upon consideration of the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and on perusal of the materials available on record, it transpires that the death of the deceased has occurred within about five years of marriage in her matrimonial home under suspicious circumstances. The allegation of cruelty on account of demand of dowry has been specifically raised by the informant.</p>	<p>Contd.</p>
------------------------------	--	---------------

<p>Contd. 28.03.2026</p>	<p>7. At this stage, the Court is not expected to conduct a meticulous examination of the evidence; however, the nature and gravity of the accusation, the manner of occurrence, and the surrounding circumstances are required to be considered. The allegations, though sought to be termed as omnibus by the defence, cannot be lightly brushed aside in a case involving alleged dowry death, particularly when the death has taken place within the statutory period after marriage and inside the matrimonial home.</p> <p>8. Considering the gravity of the offence, the nature of allegations, and the materials available in the case diary, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this stage.</p> <p>9. Accordingly, the prayer for Anticipatory bail of the petitioners stands rejected.</p> <p>10. However, it is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are confined to the disposal of the present bail application and shall not prejudice the merits of the case during trial.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be transmitted to the concerned court forthwith.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Naghma Tarannum) Addl. Sessions Judge-IV, Danapur</p>	
------------------------------	---	--