

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & A.S.J.-III, VAISHALI AT HAJIPUR

A.B.P. No. 407 of 2026

CNR No. BRVA01-001321-2026

Arising out of Hajipur Sadar P.S. Case No. 353/2025

U/ss – 89, 80, 3(5) B.N.S.

=====

Rajeev Kumar, S/o: Suresh Singh

.....

Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.....

Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the petitioner

: Sri Santosh Kr. Singh, Amarnath, Ld. Adv.

For the State

: Sri Rajkumar Singh, Ld. A.P.P.

For the Informant

: Sri Kumar Rajesham, Naveen Kr. Verma, Ld. Adv.

23.04.2026

Order

1. The anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner-**Rajeev Kumar**, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with aforesaid case, **Hajipur Sadar P.S. Case No. 353/2025, U/ss – 89, 80, 3(5) B.N.S.**

2. The Ld. Advocate on behalf of the petitioner pressed the anticipatory bail petition and submitted that, no petition for bail either regular or anticipatory has been moved earlier on behalf of this petitioner before this Court or Hon'ble High Court, Patna. That the petitioner has no bad criminal antecedent. That the petitioner is apprehending his arrest by police. That the petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. That the entire case of the prosecution is palpably false and concocted one. And no occurrence did take place as alleged by the prosecution. That the petitioner is the elder brother-in-law of deceased. That the petitioner is employee of Navayuga Engineering Company Ltd., Karwar, Karnataka and the alleged day his was posted and serving as an LMV Driver. That during investigation the police has found false implicated against the

23.04.2026	petitioner and submitted final forms as not sent up but Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate has taken cognizance against the petitioner dated. 08.12.2025 U/s. 80(3), 3(5) B.N.S. That the petitioner is not family members of deceased and he has noway concocted with alleged offence and co-accused Nibha Devi and Nisha Devi have been granted anticipatory bail by Hon'ble High Court, Patna Cr. Misc. No. 67986/25 dt. 24.09.25 and the petitioner case is on better footing. That the petitioner is ready to abide by the conditions as laid down U/s 482(3) B.N.S.S. and further he is ready to furnish sound and suitable bailors to the satisfaction of the Court. 3. The Ld. A.P.P. and Ld. Adv. Of informant vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail petition, and submitted that the petitioner is named in the FIR, and as per FIR there is direct and specific allegation against this petitioner and vide order dated 08.12.2025 Ld. C.J.M. took cognizance of offence against this petitioner. 4. As per written application of the informant-Deepan Singh, the prosecution's case in short is that, informant had married his daughter Rani Kumari as per hindu customs to Nitish Kumar. On 08.04.24. Informant had given Rs. 4 lakh in cash and goods as gift. After marriage, the boy was demanding a car and chain. On not fulfilling the demand, Nitish Kumar and his mother and sister (i) Nibha Devi, (ii) Nisha Devi and the <u>boy's elder brother-in-law's</u> name not known, and the boy's younger brother-in-law Akhilesh Kumar, all of them together used to beat his daughter. His daughter Rani Kumari was 5 months pregnant . For the last 15-20 days, the mobile was snatched from his daughter due to which there was no communication with his daughter. On dated 29.04.2025 suddenly the neighbours of his daughters-in-laws informed that his daughter is died. After getting
------------	---

23.04.2026	information when informant reached there and found dead body of his daughter lying on cot and all the family members were absconded from home, thereafter Informant informed the police about the incident. 5. Heard both the parties. Perused the L.C.R., C.D., supplementay C.D. and materials available on record. The accused-petitioner is named in the FIR, as per FIR there is direct and specific allegations against this accused petitioner. In C.D. Para-2 inquest report of deceased Rani Kumari has mentioned. In C.D. Para-10 re-statement of informant is mentioned, he supported his case. In C.D. Para-11 witness Ravi Kumar's statement is mentioned, he supported the prosecution's case. In C.D. Para-12 witness Rupali Kumari's statement is mentioned, she supported the prosecution's case. In C.D. Para-19 post-mortem report of deceased is mentioned, during examination following ante-mortem observations were made, external appearance; eyes closed, mouth closed. 1 1/2 inch wide incomplete, ellliptical ligature mark at lev of hyoid bone with knot impression inleft submandibular region. It extends from anterior border of left sternoclido mastoid musscle going to the right side, ending posteriorly at nape of neck. No other external injury. Fundal height of uterus is about 26-28 weeks. Opinion is; pregnant female with male fetus of 26-28 weeks, death is because of asphyxia due to hanging. In C.D. Para-21 witness Lalita Kumari's statement is mentioned, she supported the prosecution's case. In C.D. Para-22 witness Puja Kumari's statement is mentioned, she supported the prosecution's case. Cognizance of the offence has been taken by Ld. C.J.M. vide order dated. 08.12.2025. against this petitioner along with other co-accused.
------------	---

<u>23.04.2026</u>	6. Hence, in the light of above said, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to this accused-petitioner, the same is hereby, Rejected. 7. O/C will send the copy of this order along with L.C.R. to concerned Ld. Court below for kind information and needful. 8. The Steno is directed to upload the order on the C.I.S. District & Addl. Sessions Judge-III, Vaishali at Hajipur, 23.04.2026
---------------------------------	---