

In the Court of Additional Sessions Judge-I, Danapur

(Present:- Sri Kumar Gunjan, Addl. Sessions Judge- I, Danapur)

A.B.P. No. 1035 of 2026

(Arising out of Dulhin Bazar P.S. Case No. 162 of 2026)

1. Gyanti Devi, wife of Pappu Singh,
 2. Kashish Kumari, daughter of Pappu Singh,
 3. Pappu Singh, son of Late Ram Ayodhya Singh,
- All Resident of: Village- Raksiya, P.S.- Dulhin Bazar, Distt.- Patna

..... Petitioners

Versus.

The State of Bihar.

..... Opp.Party

Learned counsel for the petitioners :- Sri Yogendra Diwedi, (Advocate)

Learned counsel for the informant :- Miss Vidya Lakshmi, (Advocate)

Learned counsel for the State :- Sri Ramkeshwar Prasad (A.P.P.)

Order.

10-06-2026 This Anticipatory Bail petition has been filed on behalf of the above-named petitioners, who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Dulhin Bazar P.S. Case No. 162 of 2026, registered under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 85, 352, 303(2), 351(2), 3(5) of B.N.S. and 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, pending in the Court of Miss Archana Kumari, learned J.M.- Ist Class, Danapur.

Heard the learned counsels for the parties.

Apart from pleading innocence, false implication, clean antecedents and this to be the first bail application of the petitioners, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there is a delay and exaggeration in the allegations and no independent witness has supported the allegation of assault. The medical papers do not conclusively establish that the alleged bleeding or injury was caused by assault by the accused persons. In the light of the above submissions, learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Learned Addl. P.P. and learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail.

Perused the record. On perusal of the same, it transpires that the petitioners are mother-in-law, sister-in-law and father-in-law of the informant and the offences are punishable for less than seven years of imprisonment. As per para 32 of the case diary, it transpires that a notice under Section 35(3) of B.N.S.S. was also issued against the petitioners and the charge-sheet was also submitted. Investigating Officer did not choose to arrest the petitioners during entire investigation. Therefore, I do not find any need for further incarceration of this petitioner.

Therefore, considering all these facts, this Court is inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Hence, they are directed to be released, in the event of their arrest or surrender in the trial Court within Thirty (30) days from the date of this order upon their furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/-with two sureties of like amount each subject to condition as mentioned in Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned Court for information and needful.

(Dictated)

Sd./-

(Kumar Gunjan)

Addl. Sessions Judge-I, Danapur.