

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3643 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-568 Year-2024 Thana- RANIGANJ District- Araria

-
1. Domi Mandal Son of Lochan Mandal Resident of village- Kharhat, Ward no. 02, Ps- Raniganj, Dist- Araria
 2. Suren Mandal @ Surendra Mandal Son of Badari Mandal Resident of Village- Hariyabara, Ps- Araria, Dist- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sanjita Kumari Wife Shishupal Kumar Resident of village- Kharhat, Ward no. 02, Ps- Raniganj, Dist- Araria At Present Resident of village- Chhatiauna, Ward no. 12, Ps- Raniganj, Dist- Araria

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kishore Bharti, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Meena Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 17-02-2026 Heard Mr. Vijay Kishore Bharti, learned counsel for the petitioners and Ms. Meena Singh, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Raniganj P.S. Case No. 568 of 2024, F.I.R. dated 20.12.2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 85, 76, 3(5) of the B.N.S. read with section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. According to prosecution case, petitioners are alleged to have tortured and assaulted the informant and ousted



her from the matrimonial house due to non-fulfillment of demand of Rs. 2 Lakhs as a dowry.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that petitioners have clean antecedent and they have falsely been implicated in the present case. The allegation as alleged in the FIR is false and fabricated and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. It appears from the FIR itself that the date of occurrence as alleged in the FIR is 07.08.2024 but the present FIR has been instituted on 20.12.2024 after delay of more than four months without giving any plausible explanation for such delay. Petitioner no. 1 is father-in-law and petitioner no. 2 is brother-in-law of the informant. Apart from that there is no specific allegation against the petitioners in the FIR rather there is general and omnibus allegation that all the accused persons demanded the dowry from the family members of the informant.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, petitioners having clean antecedent and the fact that there is no specific allegation against the petitioners as alleged in the FIR, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of their arrest or



surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned C.J.M., Supaul, in connection with Raniganj P.S. Case No. 568 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under section 482(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and with other following conditions:

i. Petitioners shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bonds shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioners tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioners have concealed their 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 or in the name of
verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

