

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58577 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-828 Year-2024 Thana- SASARAM NAGAR District- Rohtas

1. Vinay Kumar@ Vinay Singh Son of Aashmuni Singh @ Aasmuni Singh Resident of Village- Bharkhar, P.S.- Mohaniya, District- Kaimur (Bhabhua)
2. Indu Singh Wife of Vinay Kumar @ Vinay Singh Resident of Village- Bharkhar, P.S.- Mohaniya, District- Kaimur (Bhabhua)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shekhar Singh, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Sumit Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 29-08-2025 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioners apprehends their arrest in connection with Sasaram Town Model P.S. Case No. 828 of 2024 registered for the offences under Sections 341, 323, 504, 506, 509, 498A and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961.

3. As per the prosecution case, the marriage of informant's daughter was solemnized with the son of the petitioners and certain gifts were given at the time of marriage. Thereafter all the accused persons used to assault and torture her. It is further alleged that for want of dowry, all the accused



persons used to torture continuously and at one stage the son of the petitioners tried to kill his daughter.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in the instant case. He further submits that petitioners happens to be Father-in-law and Mother-in-law to the informant's daughter and there is general and omnibus allegation levelled against them. It has further been submitted that from bare perusal of the F.I.R., it would be evident that the allegations are primarily of the period right since the marriage that has been solemnized on 28.11.2021. It has also been submitted that the petitioners used to reside in Delhi while their son was transferred to Hyderabad and right since the marriage, petitioners did not reside with the daughter-in-law. It has next been submitted that it was only when the petitioner's son sent legal notice to his wife that the present case was filed against the petitioners on a false and concocted story of demand of dowry. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioners carries clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case



and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, let the petitioners above named be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/-(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 Sasaram Town Model P.S. Case No. 828 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S as well as subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors of the petitioners will be his close relative.

(ii) The petitioners will remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates, or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioners will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.

(iv) If the petitioners are found involved in similar nature of offence in future, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of their bail bond.

(v) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case at any stage it is found



that the petitioners has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioners. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of the same or in the name of verification.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is allowed.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

