

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.2526 of 2025

1. Sugandha Kumari aged about 22 years, daughter of Ashok Prasad.
2. Sushma Kumari, aged about 20 years, daughter of Santosh Prasad
3. Shimpi Kumari aged about 19 years, daughter of Ashok Prasad.
4. Sushila Devi aged about 44 years W/o Santosh Prasad
5. Santosh Prasad aged about 52 years son of Rajnath Saw,
All are residents of Village Tisibar, P.O. and P.S. Pandu,
District Palamau. **... .. Petitioners**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. Kanchan Gupta, W/o Shrawan Prasad.

... .. Opposite Parties

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Pankaj Kumar, P.P.
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Ashutosh Kumar Ranjan, Adv.

05/ 10.07.2025

Heard the parties.

2. This anticipatory bail application under Sections 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has been preferred by the petitioners apprehending their arrest in connection with Pandu P.S. Case No.01 of 2025, for offences under Sections 115(2). 117(2), 352, 85, 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. The case is presently pending before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Palamau at Daltonganj.

3. The allegation against the petitioners is that on 18.01.2025, the brother of the informant had come to the house of the informant to inform her about the receipt of notice of divorce case filed by her husband and when he left her house, the petitioners abused and assaulted her in order to kill her.

4. During the course of argument, learned counsel on behalf of the state submits that initially the petitioners did not appear before the I.O. but after the issuance of warrant of arrest, the petitioners appeared before the I.O. and submitted their defence.

5. The learned counsel for the informant opposes the prayer and submitted that the I.O. was not satisfied with their reply.

6. The case is under Sections 115(2), 117(2), 352, 85, 3(5) of B.N.S. and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act which are punishable for a period of seven years or less. Thus, the case is covered by the judgment of in the case of **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation & Another**, reported in **(2022) 10 SCC 51** as well as the observation made in the case of **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation & Another** reported in **(2021) 10 SCC 773**.

7. If the petitioners have already appeared before the I.O. and have not been arrested by the I.O., I am of the opinion that I.O. does not feel it necessary to arrest the petitioners, provided that the petitioners regularly joins the investigation. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits the petitioners will join the investigation and will appear before the I.O. as and when required.

8. Considering the aforesaid submission and in view of the judgment of **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation & Another**, reported in **(2022) 10 SCC 51** as well as the observation made in the case of **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation & Another** reported in **(2021) 10 SCC 773**, the petitioners are directed to appear before

concerned Court who will pass an appropriate order taking into consideration the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court with an undertaking that the petitioners will appear before the concerned I.O. once in every 15 days till submission of final report. If at all charge-sheet is filed, the court will take appropriate steps so that the process of framing charge can be started within two months from the filing of charge-sheet. Further undertaking will be given by the petitioners that they will cooperate with the trial and they will appear before the trial Court as and when directed by the trial Court.

9. Learned counsel for the informant also submits that the petitioners have detained all the educational testimonials and he prays that a direction may be given to them in this regard.

10. So far as the request made by the petitioners in respect of order to return the testimonies is concerned, that is beyond the scope of this anticipatory bail application. Informant may take appropriate steps for redressal of the grievance.

11. With the aforesaid observation, this Anticipatory Bail Application stands **disposed of**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)