

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14630 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-186 Year-2024 Thana- RAHIKA District- Madhubani

-
1. Ram Prakash Yadav @ Ram Pragash Yadav S/O Late Bokan Yadav @ Bauku Yadav R/O village - Bagdha, P.S.- Kamtaul, District - Madhubani
 2. Phulo Devi W/O Ram Prakash Yadav @ Ram Pragash Yadav R/O village - Bagdha, P.S.- Kamtaul, District - Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rinku Devi W/O Bipin Kumar Akela, D/O Ram Swarth Yadav R/O village - Saptaa, P.S.- Rahika, District - Madhubani

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav, Adv. Mr. Udeshya Kumar Yadav, Adv. Mr. Ravi Prakash, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 12-05-2025 Heard the learned Advocate for the petitioners, learned Advocate for the informant and the learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Rahika P.S. Case No. 186 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 85, 318(4), 126(2), 115(2), 76, 109, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. The prosecution alleged that the marriage of the informant was solemnized on 20.02.2015 along with the son of the petitioners. Despite the sufficient dowry and expenses done



in the marriage, the accused persons, soon after the marriage, kept on demanding dowry and non fulfillment of the same resulted into torture in various ways. The informant also blessed with a son in the year 2016, but the accused persons did not mend their ways. On 09.05.2024, in order to resolve the dispute, a *panchayati* was also done and written agreement was prepared, but to no respite. The victim was subjected to severe torture, hence she left the matrimonial home on 27.07.2024 and got her treatment done. It is further alleged that on 04.08.2024, all the accused persons, including the petitioners have also assaulted her due to which she sustained head injury.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioners taking this Court through the FIR contended that admittedly the marriage was solemnized long back in the year 2015 and, as such, any demand of dowry after nine years of marriage does not inspire any confidence. However, even if the allegation is to be taken into account, it is specifically attributed against brother-in-law, who assaulted the informant on 27.07.2024 and thereafter on 04.08.2024, due to which the informant sustained an injury over her head. It is lastly contended that the petitioners are none else but the parents-in-law and they have least concern with the affairs of the husband and wife. However, only in order to wreck



vengeance and mounts pressure, their names have been implicated in this case. It is lastly contended that, be that as it may, the injury which is sustained to the informant, the same has been found to be simple in nature.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposed the pre-arrest bail application and submitted that the FIR specifically alleged the involvement of the petitioners in crime, leading to serious injury caused to her and she has also been ousted from her matrimonial house, despite the fact that the marriage was solemnized in the year 2015.

6. Regard being had to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the fact that the marriage was solemnized in the year 2015 and the petitioners are parents-in-law, coupled with the simple nature of injury, let the petitioners above named be released on bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) **each** with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M. 1st, Madhubani in connection with Rahika P.S. Case No. 186 of 2024, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) Bharatiya Nagarik



Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with the further condition that one of the bailors shall be the own/close family members of the petitioners.

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

