

In the Court of District & Additional Sessions Judge-I
Presiding Officer:-Dushyant Kumar
Rosera , District-Samastipur
A.B.P. No. 1418 of 2026
(CIS No. 320 of 2026)
(Arising out of Bibhutipur P.S. Case No. 245 of 2025)
Date: 15.07.2026

Vishnu Jha @ Visnukant Jha

.....Accused/Petitioner.

vs.

State of Bihar.

.....Prosecution/O.P.

ORDER

1. The present petition has been filed by the accused petitioner, namely, Vishnu Jha @ Visnukant Jha Singh seeking anticipatory bail apprehending his arrest in connection with Bibhutipur P.S. Case No. 245 of 2025, registered under Section 80, 238, 3 (5) of the B.N.S.
2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution based upon the self application of the informant, namely, Shivdani Mishra, is that he solemnized the marriage of his daughter namely Sarojani Devi with Rajesh Jha Son of Vishnu Jha, according to Hindu customs and traditions. The informant spent a large amount on the marriage as gifts. He gave approximately Rs. 1, 51,000/- in cash, one gold ornaments, two Bharies silver, utensils, furniture, clothes etc. After the marriage, his daughter lived properly at her matrimonial home for some time. Later, the members of her in-laws family, namely Vishnu Jha (father-in-law), Rakesh Jha, Rajive Jha, Chintu Jha started demanding two lakh rupees from his daughter. When the demand was not fulfilled, they used to beat her and also deprived her of food and other necessities. In the meanwhile, from this wedlock, daughter of informant was blessed with one male child. About one month ago, his daughter came to her parental home after escaping those people. On 10.06.2025, father-in-law of the informant's daughter came to his house and requested that his daughter be sent back to her matrimonial home. Considering his request, informant sent his daughter with him. On 14.06.2025, the informant came to know that the aforesaid persons had murdered his daughter and disappeared her corpse. Thereafter, informant and his family members came there and came to know that after murdering her they fled away. The informant, informed the police by calling 112. Thereafter police came and efforts were made to trace her in nearby areas, but his daughter could not be found.
3. Heard Sri Raj Kumar Ld. Counsel for the petitioner as well as Ld. APP for the state.
4. Ld. Counsel for the accused petitioner has submitted that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. No anticipatory or regular bail petition on behalf of the above named petitioner was ever filed either in the Ld. Sessions Court or before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna nor is pending anywhere. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent. It is further submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence has has been falsely implicated in this case out of malice, enmity and grudge. It is further submitted that from perusal of the F.I.R. it is apparent that there is no specific allegations against the petitioner rather vague and omnibus allegation against him. He further submits that there was happy conjugal life in between the deceased and her husband. He further submits that

In the Court of District & Additional Sessions Judge-I
Presiding Officer:-Dushyant Kumar
Rosera , District-Samastipur
A.B.P. No. 1418 of 2026
(CIS No. 320 of 2026)
(Arising out of Bibhutipur P.S. Case No. 245 of 2025)
Date: 15.07.2026

the petitioner never tortured the deceased Sarojani Devi and he was maintaining her with full dignity and honour as per his economical condition. Petitioner is living separately from her son Rajesh Jha who is husband of the deceased, as such he has been implicated in this case without any fault. It is further submitted that deceased sarojani Devi died due to illness. He further submits that there is no hand of this petitioner in the death of the deceased rather he was victim of the circumstances because he is father-in-law of the deceased. It is further submitted that there is no chance of absconding and tempering with the evidence. The petitioners undertake to abide by all terms and conditions as mentioned under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

5. On the other hand Ld. APP. on behalf of state opposed the prayer for bail.
6. Perused the records. On perusal of the records, it transpires that the present case has been instituted against the accused persons, including the present petitioner, under Sections 80, 238 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, on the allegation that, in furtherance of the common intention, they caused the death of the informant's daughter on account of non-fulfilment of dowry demand and thereafter concealed her dead body. The First Information Report contains a specific allegation against the present petitioner that he had brought the deceased from her parental home shortly before the occurrence. The investigation is still in progress.
7. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case including the fact that the accusation pertains to a grave and heinous offence involving the alleged dowry death of a young married woman, it appears that it would not be appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the present petitioner.
8. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.
9. Let a copy of this order along with the LCR be sent to the Court of the Ld. Magistrate concerned.

Dictated
Sd/-
District & Additional Sessions Judge -1
Rosera, Samastipur