



UPSI010039102026

The Court of District & Sessions Judge, Sitapur.

CIS No.- 1728/2026

Bail Application No. 734/2026

Sarla @ Ramshri		Accused-applicant.,
Versus		
State of U.P.		Respondent.

Case Crime No.- 118/2026

Section- 80(2), 85 BNS

3/4 DP Act

P.S.- Khairabad, District Sitapur.

Disposed Bail Application Order

1. This bail application has been filed by the accused-applicant **Sarla @ Ramshri** in Case Crime No. 118/2026 under Sections 80(2), 85 BNS & 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, P.S. Khairabad, District Sitapur.
2. In connection with the present bail application, an affidavit of **Anoop Kumar** has also been filed stating that this is the first bail application of the accused-applicant. No other bail application has been filed by the accused-applicant either before this Court or before the Hon'ble High Court, nor is any bail application pending or rejected.
3. The brief facts of the case are that the complainant Ramu alleged that he had solemnized the marriage of his daughter Anju with accused Shailendra, about three years prior to the incident. At the time of marriage, the complainant had given dowry worth approximately Rs. 4,00,000/- according to his financial capacity, but the accused persons, namely Shailendra, Chandrabhan, Sarla, Vipin and the wife of Vipin, were dissatisfied with the dowry and had been demanding an additional amount of Rs. 2,00,000/- in cash and used to harass, assault and subject the deceased to cruelty on account of the said demand and also deprived her of proper maintenance and food. During the subsistence of the marriage, a male child namely Shreyansh was born out of the wedlock, who is presently about one year of age. On the night of 01.05.2026, all the accused persons, acting in furtherance of their common intention and on account of the demand for additional dowry, assaulted the deceased and caused her death. Upon receiving

information, the complainant along with his family members reached Village Kaithabhari at about 2:00 a.m. and found his daughter lying dead on a bed inside a room. When the complainant inquired about the incident, none of the accused persons disclosed the true facts regarding the death of the deceased.

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused-applicant and D.G.C. Criminal for the State and perused the record.
5. Learned counsel for the accused-applicant stated that the applicant/accused is a poor and elderly woman suffering from several serious diseases and is undergoing treatment from various doctors. Due to her old age and medical condition, she is unable to hear and see properly. She has no criminal history. She has been falsely implicated in the present case and is innocent. The FIR is alleged to be based on false and fabricated facts. There is no independent witness of the said incident. On the date of the incident, the deceased Anju had prepared food and all family members had their meals peacefully, and no dispute, quarrel, assault or altercation took place. The deceased used to remain active on social media platforms such as Instagram and Facebook, where she regularly uploaded videos and appeared to be living happily. Neither the applicant nor her family members ever demanded any dowry, and neither the deceased nor her parental family ever made any complaint regarding dowry demand at any point of time. According to the applicant, the deceased committed suicide by hanging herself. The deceased left behind her one-year-old son Shreyansh, who is presently dependent upon the applicant for his care and upbringing, as the applicant's husband and son are in jail and the parents of the deceased are unwilling to take custody of the child. On the night of the incident, after dinner, she and her husband went to sleep elsewhere, while her son Shailendra slept in the verandah with the child. During the night, the deceased allegedly left her son near Shailendra and later, when the child woke up crying, Shailendra went inside and found the deceased hanging. Believing that she might still be alive, he brought her down and attempted to take her for treatment, and it was Shailendra himself who informed the parental family of the deceased about the incident. The FIR of the said incident has been lodged after a delay of about two days without any satisfactory explanation. The accused-applicant, if enlarged on bail, is ready and willing to abide by the terms and conditions imposed by this Hon'ble

Court and shall not misuse the liberty of bail granted to her and will appear before the Court on each date of hearing.

6. Per contra, learned D.G.C. Criminal and learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed this bail application.
7. Case diary and material available on record have been perused. From the perusal of the FIR, it transpires that the deceased Anju was married to son of accused-applicant about three years prior to the incident. Further from FIR it transpires that the accused persons, including the present accused-applicant Sarla, were dissatisfied with the dowry given at the time of marriage and were continuously demanding an additional sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- in cash and the deceased was subjected to cruelty and harassment in connection with the said demand. In this connection I have also gone through the post-mortem report of the deceased Anju, wherein the cause of death has been opined as *asphyxia* as a result of ante-mortem hanging. The deceased died under unnatural circumstances at her matrimonial home within seven years of her marriage. The allegations of dowry demand and cruelty have been specifically levelled against the accused-applicant. Considering the nature and gravity of the accusations, the material available on record and the fact that the death occurred within seven years of marriage in her matrimonial home, this Court does not find any sufficient ground for grant of bail at this stage. Thereafter, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the bail application of the accused-applicant is liable to be **rejected**.

ORDER

This bail application moved on behalf of the accused-applicant **Sarla @ Ramshri** in Case Crime No. 118/2026 under Sections 80(2), 85 of the BNS and 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, P.S. Khairabad, District Sitapur is hereby, **rejected**.

Date: 18.06.2026

(Incharge)
District & Sessions Judge
Sitapur
J.O. Code- UP- 6113