IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 7830 of 2026

1. Md. Allaudin Ansari @ Allaudin Ansari, aged about 66 years S/O Late Kheman Mia,
2. Md. Mehtab Ansari @ Mehtab Ansari aged about 24 years S/o Md. Allaudin Ansari @ Allaudin Ansari,
   Both are R/o- Chourapatti, P.O and P.S- Hariharpur, District-Dhanbad. **… … Petitioners**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **… … Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Deepak Sahu, Advocate
For the Informant : Mr. Shailesh Kr. Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, APP

08/**31.08.2026**

1. Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 25.03.2026 in connection with Hariharpur P.S Case No. 16 of 2026 registered u/s-80, 3(5) of the B.N.S and section 3/4 of the D.P Act pending in the Court of the Learned J.M, 1st Class, Dhanbad.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the alleged incident is dated 16.03.2026. The petitioners are in custody since 25.02.2026. Petitioner No.1 is the father-in-law and petitioner No.2 is the brother-in-law of the deceased. He has submitted that the marriage had taken place on 28.10.2019. Learned counsel has submitted that there are general and omnibus allegation against the petitioners and there are altogether 12 charge-sheet witnesses. Charge has been framed on 19.08.2026 for alleged offence under Section 80(2), 3(5) of the BNS and Section 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. The next date in the trial court is on 16.09.2026 for prosecution witness.

4. During the course of hearing, he has submitted that the petitioners used to reside separately, but no such material could be

pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioners from the case diary. He has simply stated that there was some panchayati way back in the year 2022, in which the grievance of the deceased was mentioned that she was not being permitted to go to her parents' house.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party informant and the State have opposed the prayer for bail and have submitted that there are serious and direct allegation against all the accused persons and the death has occurred in the matrimonial home within 7 years of marriage and she was assaulted and killed.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that the deceased died in her matrimonial home within 7 years of marriage and it appears that the petitioners, deceased and her husband were all residing together and material witnesses are yet to be examined, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail.

7. The instant bail application is hereby **rejected**.

8. However, the State is directed to ensure prompt production of witnesses before the court. The viscera report from FSL be forwarded to the concerned court.

9. Learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director, Prosecution as well as Superintendent of Police of the concerned district to ensure compliance.

10. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through 'FAX/E-mail'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

31.08.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded on:-02.09.2026