

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8646 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2016 Thana- AURANGABAD COMPLAINT CASE  
District- Aurangabad

- 
1. JUNAID ANSARI Son of Late Heyat Ansari Resident of Village - Muslimabad, P.S. - Haspura, District - Aurangabad.
  2. Nazbun Khatun Wife of Junaid Ansari Resident of Village - Muslimabad, P.S. - Haspura, District - Aurangabad.
  3. Afsana Khatun D/o Junaid Ansari Resident of Village - Muslimabad, P.S. - Haspura, District - Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shailesh Kumar Singh, Advocate  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar, APP

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      02-09-2022                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 304(B), 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The complainant alleges that his daughter (deceased) was married to Samir Ansari on 18.01.2015, it is next alleged that the accused persons, including the petitioners, started demanding land by way of dowry but even after execution of sale deed, the accused people continued to torture the deceased and on 06.09.2015, the accused persons killed the deceased and



cremated her body without informing the complainant and when he returned from Mumbai, he came to know about death of the deceased by strangulation, it is also alleged that police did not register F.I.R. as such the complaint came to be instituted.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and have been falsely implicated in the present case, petitioner nos. 2 and 3 are women and petitioner no.3 is 19 years of age and from perusal of the complaint petition itself it would manifest that the complainant has clearly alleged in the complaint that he received information about death of his daughter on 09.09.2015 but the complaint came to be filed on 05.02.2016 i.e., after more than five months of the occurrence. Learned counsel further submits that it absolutely does not stand to reason that if the complainant came to know about the death of his daughter on 09.09.2015 why he did not immediately rush to the matrimonial home of the deceased for lodging an F.I.R. or a complaint, the fact that complainant instituted the present case after a delay of nearly five months in itself demonstrates about the falsity of the allegations. Learned counsel next submits that petitioners are father-in-law, mother-in-law and sister-in-law of the deceased and are separate in mess and property from the husband of the



deceased.

Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Daudnagar (Aurangabad) Complaint Case No. 45 of 2016 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

Rishi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

