

**IN THE COURT OF 01<sup>st</sup> DISTRICT & ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE**

**ROHTAS AT SASARAM**

**ANTICIPATORY BAIL PETITION NO. 547 of 2026**

**Arising out of Rohtas P.s. Case No. 48 of 2026**

**Under section 115(2), 126(2), 352, 88, 85, 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,2023 & Section 3, 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act 1961**

**IN THE MATTER OF:-**

**1. Lilawati Devi**, Aged about 56 years,  
W/o- Jeetendra Kumar

**2. Jeetendra Kumar**, Aged about 62 years  
S/o- Late Jagnarayan Prasad

Both R/o Village :- Baradhigola, P.S. Akdodhigola, District - Rohtas

..... Petitioners.

Versus

The State of Bihar

..... Opposite Party.

For the Petitioners : Mr. Nityanand Pandey, Ld. Advocate.

For the O. P. (State) : Mr. Upendra Kumar, Ld. P.P.

**ORDER**

**16.04.2026** This **pre-arrest bail** has been preferred u/s 482 of Bharatiya Suraksha Nagrik Sanhita, 2023 (438 Cr.P.C.) on behalf of the above noted accused persons apprehension of arrest in connection with Rohtas P.s. Case No. - 48 of 2026 for the offence under section 115(2), 126(2), 352, 88, 85, 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,2023 & Section 3, 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act 1961. The parties have already been heard. The matter is posted today for order. The order follows:-

The learned counsel for petitioners / accused persons reading out the contents of F.I.R., has submitted that the petitioners are old mother-in-law and father-in-law of the informant and which are quite innocent and have committed no offence as alleged in the F.I.R. and the allegations leveled against the petitioners are purely vague and omnibus in nature lacking any specific date, time or instance of the alleged occurrence and this F.I.R. is a counter-blast to the matrimonial(divorce) case no. 192 of 2025 filed by the petitioner's son rahul kumar on dated 09.05.2025 against his wife kajal kumari who is the informant of this F.I.R. and this criminal case was filed after a huge delay of nine months to harass and humiliate the petitioners and their son rahul kumar. He further added that there is an un-explained delay of about 20 months from the time and the informant left her matrimonial home(June, 2024) to the lodging of the F.I.R. (16.02.2026) suggesting a manufactured and after-thought narratives. He further added that the informant suffers from a severe mental disorder(psychosis) for which she was treated by eminent doctors and he history of suicidal acts (e.g. consuming harpic) was already detailed in the prior divorce petition. He further submitted that the allegation regarding the "Mount Abu Rajasthan incident" against the petitioner's son rahul kumar is patently absurd as forcing a person who admittedly does not know how to drive to operate a scooty on a hilly track is logically impossible. He further added that there is no medical or injury report to support the grave charge of "forced abortion" proving the allegation is a figment of imagination and all sections are bailable except 85 B.N.S.,2023 and ¼ of Dowry Prohibition Act which are not applicable. He further submitted that petitioners are ready to obey all conditions as laid down under section 482(2) of the

**IN THE COURT OF 01<sup>st</sup> DISTRICT & ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE**  
**ROHTAS AT SASARAM**  
**ANTICIPATORY BAIL PETITION NO. 547 of 2026**  
**Arising out of Rohtas P.s. Case No. 48 of 2026**  
**Under section 115(2), 126(2), 352, 88, 85, 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,2023 &**  
**Section 3, 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act 1961**

**Continued....**  
**16.04.2026**

B.N.S.S.,2023 and the petitioners are men of means so no question arises regarding their absconding or tampering with the evidence and are ready to furnish the bail bonds and sureties to the satisfaction of the Id. Court and prayed to enlarge the petitioners on pre-arrest bail.

Per contra, the Ld. P.P appearing for the State has opposed the prayer for pre- arrest bail submitting that the allegation is direct against the accused persons /petitioners and serious in nature. Hence, prayed to reject it.

After cogitating over the contents of the Ld. Counsel for the parties it goes to appear from the record that the case has been filed under section 115(2), 126(2), 352, 88, 85, 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,2023 & Section 3, 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act 1961 against the petitioners including their son namely rahul kumar. It has come to fore during the course of hearing as well as from contents advanced by the Ld. Counsel that the petitioners are in-laws of the victim, being the mother-in-law and father-in- law. No threat of tempering of evidence or any other kind has been raised before this Court. In such state of the fact taking note of the matter as arisen out of the conjugal dispute deteriorated into such a shape, this court is of the view to extend a warning chance to applicants/accused persons thereby allowing them to be released on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- with two sureties each with the like amount, in the event of their arrest or surrender, before the Court in seisin of original record, within a period of fortnight with further condition to be under taken at the time of furnishing of bail bonds u/s 482 (2) of B.N.S.S., 2023. Accordingly, the prayer of pre-arrest bail is **allowed** with a further condition that the petitioners, being parents, they will leave no stone unturned to endeavour for amicable reach thereby to save the nuptial journey of the husband and wife, in hot water.

(Dictated)

**(Illegible)**

(Pankaj Mishra)

1<sup>st</sup> District & Additional Sessions Judge,  
Rohtas at Sasaram  
16.04.2026