

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 7282 of 2025

1. Vinay Kumar @ Vinay Karmali, aged about 36 years, S/o Dulal Chand Vishwakarma, resident of Ravi Das Tola, P.O. Digwar, P.S. Mandu, District- Ramgarh, Jharkhand
 2. Lalmani Devi @ Lalmuni Devi, aged about 64 years, W/o Dulal Chand Vishwakarma, resident of Ravi Das Tola, P.O. Digwar, P.S. Mandu, District- Ramgarh, Jharkhand
- ... Petitioners**

-Versus-

The State of Jharkhand

... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners	: Mrs. Darshana Poddar Mishra, Advocate Mr. Rohit, Advocate
For the State	: Mrs. Anuradha Sahay, A.P.P.
For the Informant	: Mr. Sahil, Advocate

04/07.05.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, learned counsel appearing for the State and learned counsel appearing for the informant.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Mandu (Kuju) P.S. Case No.235 of 2025 dated 25.10.2025, registered for the offence under Sections 80, 3(5) of the BNS, 2023, pending in the Court of the learned A.C.J.M., Ramgarh.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that petitioner no.1 is the husband and petitioner no.2 is the mother-in-law of the deceased. She further submits that the allegations are made that in-laws have burnt the deceased and pursuant to that, she has died. She then submits that on the fateful day, the husband was on his duty at Jamshedpur in a company, where, he is working. She next submits that the statement of sister-in-law recorded in para 12 of the case diary and audio recording disclosed in para 43 of the case diary clearly suggest that the petitioners have not done any wrong to put fire on the body of the deceased. She also submits that the family

members including the mother-in-law when found fire on the body of the deceased, they have taken a blanket from nearby and covered body of the deceased and, thereafter they have taken her to the hospital and she was being treated in the hospital and after six days of admission in the hospital, she has died. She further submits that the petitioners are co-operating in the investigation and they are further ready to co-operate in the investigation.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that within seven years of marriage, such occurrence has taken place. She further submits that there is also allegation of demand of dowry against the petitioners.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer and he adopts the argument of the learned counsel appearing for the State. He further adds that the complicity of the petitioners is there. He next submits that petitioner no.1 is husband and in view of that, the prayer for anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

6. On query made by the Court, learned counsel appearing for the State fairly submits that in para 12 of the case diary, the statement of Nisha Kumari has been recorded, who is the sister-in-law of the deceased and she has stated that while the deceased was shifting stove from courtyard to kitchen all of a sudden, the deceased was caught in fire. When that witness heard the noise, she went in the kitchen and found that the body of the deceased was on fire and, thereafter, she has also made noise and pursuant to that, mother-in-law of the deceased has also come and they have taken blanket from nearby and covered the body of the deceased. It has also come that they have taken the deceased to the hospital where she was treated for six

days and, thereafter, she had died and pursuant to that, the present FIR has been lodged.

7. On query made by the Court, learned counsel appearing for the State further fairly submits that in para 43 of the case diary, audio recording has come, wherein, it has been found that the deceased was saying her husband that she is alright and told her husband to continue with his work.

8. Looking into paras 12 and 43 of the case diary, the Court finds that what has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the State, those facts are there and in the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

9. Accordingly, the above-named petitioners are directed to surrender before the learned Court within three weeks from today and in the event of their arrest or surrender, they shall be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Twenty Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned A.C.J.M., Ramgarh in connection with Mandu (Kuju) P.S. Case No.235 of 2025, subject to the conditions that the petitioners will co-operate in the investigation and also subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

*Dated: 7th May, 2026
Ajay/*