

KANHAIYA JEE CHOUDHARY
Sessions Judge, Purnea.
BP No.202 of 2026/CIS No.202 of 2026
Sanjiv Sahani @ Sanjit Sahani Versus State
(arising out of Sadar P.S. Case No.574 of 2025)
Date of Order : 19.3.2026

IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE, PURNEA

Bail Petition No.202 of 2026

Sanjiv Sahani @ Sanjit Sahani, aged about 45 years, R/o Gulabbag Lakripatti, P.S.Sadar, District Purnea. At present R/o Rajhat, Gayatri Nagar, Ward No.17, P.S. Banmankhi, District Purnea. .. Petitioner.

Versus

State of Bihar

.. Opp. Party

Date of order or proceeding	Order with signature of the court	Office action taken with date
19.3.2026	1. Bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioner, namely, Sanjiv Sahani @ Sanjit Sahani, who is in judicial custody since 14.12.2025 in connection with Sadar P.S. Case No.574 of 2025 registered for the offence under sections 80,3(5) of the BNS is put-up for hearing. 2. Heard Sri Manoj Kumar Singh, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioners and Sri A.K.Tiwary, the learned P.P. for the state. 3. As per written report of the Informant, the prosecution case, in brief, is that his second sister, namely, Neha Kumari (deceased) was married with Rambali Sahni according to Hindu rites and ritual three years ago. After some days of marriage of his said sister, the in-laws named in the FIR including the petitioner being Bhaisur of the deceased in furtherance of their common intention of all started torturing her mentally and physically in so many ways for fulfillment of dowry demand. On 16.11.2025 at about 11 A.M., Informant came to know that all the FIR named accused persons in furtherance of their common intention of all committed murder of his sister Neha Kumari and hanged her dead body to give a colour for committing suicide by the deceased. 4. Learned counsel for petitioner submitted that petitioner is bhaisur of the deceased and he is living separately from the deceased and her husband and the petitioners has no concerned	

Contd. 19.3.2026	with the business of deceased and her husband. Petitioner is living at Banmankhi with her family members. He also submitted that as a matter of fact, deceased died in her matrimonial house by committing suicide due to dispute between deceased and her husband and Informant taking the advantage of aforesaid occurrence, implicated these petitioners by concocting a false story only with a view either to harass them or to extort money. The allegation levelled against the petitioner in the FIR is contradictory from the statement of the witnesses and there is no specific overt-act against them. Prior to institution of this case, neither the deceased nor the Informant made any complain against the petitioner regarding any atrocities. Petitioner is a man of clean antecedent and there is no chance of his absconding and he is judicial custody since 14.12.2025 without any fault. So, prayed for anticipatory bail. 5. On the contrary learned P.P.I/c opposed the prayer of bail petition of petitioner and submitted that petitioner is full brother of husband of the deceased and this petitioner is also responsible for the alleged occurrence and investigation of the case is still pending. So, prayed to dismiss the instant bail petition. 6. I have heard rival submissions of both the parties and perused the case record and case diary. It appears that it is a case of dowry death and petitioner is named in the FIR being full brother of husband of the deceased with allegation that all the FIR named accused persons in furtherance of their common intention of all committed murder of the deceased for non-fulfillment of dowry demand and hanged her dead body to give a colour of suicide. The aforesaid FIR is contradictory to the statement of the witnesses recorded by the Police during the course of investigation relating to the petitioner. From perusal of post mortem report of the deceased, it appears that admittedly, the death of deceased Neha Kumari was unnatural but this	
---------------------	---	--

Contd. 19.3.2026	petitioner alongwith his family members are living separately and he is doing business at Banmankhi and he has no concerned with the business of deceased and her husband. There is no specific allegation against the petitioner regarding involvement in the alleged occurrence. It also appears that co-accused being wife and married daughter of the petitioner has already been granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 29.1.2026 passed in ABP No.36 of 2026 by this court. Petitioner seems to clean antecedent and he is in judicial custody since 14.12.2025. 7. Considering the fact and circumstances discussed above, petitioner seems to be lived separately from the deceased and her husband and manner of allegation levelled against the petitioner being elder brother of the husband of the deceased and there is no specific overt-act against him and petitioner is in judicial custody since 14.12.2025, so, bail petition of petitioner, namely, Sanjiv Sahni @ Sanjit Sahni is allowed. Petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bonds of Rs.10,000/-(Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below, subject to condition that petitioner shall remain physically present, as directed by the court, on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court concern. (Dictated & corrected by me) Sd/- Sessions Judge,Purnea. <table border="1"><tr><td>Date of Order</td><td>19.3.2026</td></tr><tr><td>Date of Reserving Judgment/ order</td><td>19.3.2026</td></tr><tr><td>Uploading Date</td><td>25.3.2026</td></tr><tr><td>Uploaded by</td><td>Kumar Sanjay,Steno</td></tr></table>	Date of Order	19.3.2026	Date of Reserving Judgment/ order	19.3.2026	Uploading Date	25.3.2026	Uploaded by	Kumar Sanjay,Steno
Date of Order	19.3.2026								
Date of Reserving Judgment/ order	19.3.2026								
Uploading Date	25.3.2026								
Uploaded by	Kumar Sanjay,Steno								