

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49147 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-74 Year-2025 Thana- AMBA District- Aurangabad

-
1. Tunna Chaudhary S/o Late Ramchandra Chaudhary R/o Village- Bhaluari Khurd, P.S.- Amba, District- Aurangabad
 2. Binda Devi W/o Tunna Chaudhary R/o Village- Bhaluari Khurd, P.S.- Amba, District- Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mahendra Chaudhary S/o Kushar Chaudhary R/o Vill- Ahmadpur (Charkawa), P.S.- Rafiganj, Distt- Auragabad

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vishwa Ranjan Choudhary

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Sharma

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA

ORAL ORDER

2 12-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Amba P.S. Case No. 74 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 80/30(5) of the BNS and Section 3/4 of the D.P. Act.

3. As per First Information Report, the marriage of the informant's daughter was solemnized with the son of the petitioner in March, 2024. The informant had given gift of Rupees Five Lakhs at the time of marriage. It has further been alleged that in-laws of the informant's daughter started demanding further dowry and due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, his daughter was tortured physically and mentally. On 27.04.2025, the informant got



information that the petitioners along with the other accused persons have administered poison to his daughter.

4. Mr. Vishwa Ranjan Choudhary, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are father-in-law and mother-in-law of the deceased and have falsely been implicated being the in-laws of the deceased. During the course of investigation, the witnesses have said that the deceased consumed poison on her own and has committed suicide. He further submits that she was taken to the hospital where she died during the course of treatment. He next submits that the property was divided among the family members in the year 2022 and the petitioners were residing separately in their own room.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

6. I have heard the parties and perused the materials on record.

7. There is specific allegation in the F.I.R. that just after the marriage of the deceased, her in-laws started demanding dowry and due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, she was being tortured physically and mentally.

8. Nature of death is not important in such kind of cases whether it is suicidal, accidental or homicidal. The deceased met



with an unnatural death in her matrimonial home within one year of marriage. In a close proximity of time, there is demand of dowry and unnatural death of the deceased in her matrimonial home. There is specific allegation of demand of dowry and torture against these petitioners and also there is presumption against the petitioners under Sections 117 and 118 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam.

9. In view of the above, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to these petitioners. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

Saif/-

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

