

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21301 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-437 Year-2025 Thana- JANDAHA District- Vaishali

1. Nandlal Singh Son of Late Mahadev Singh Resident of Village - Rampur, Bhanborhan, P.S.- Jandaha, District - Vaishali
2. Shanti Devi Wife of Nandlal Singh Resident of Village - Rampur, Bhanborhan, P.S.- Jandaha, District - Vaishali
3. Dharmendra Singh @ Dharmendra Kumar Son of Nandlal Singh Resident of Village - Rampur, Bhanborhan, P.S.- Jandaha, District - Vaishali
4. Bilendra Singh @ Birendra Kumar Singh @ Virendra Kumar Singh Son of Nandlal Singh Resident of Village - Rampur, Bhanborhan, P.S.- Jandaha, District - Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Vinod Kumar Singh, S/o Late Ram Ashish Singh, R/o-Village-Vishanpur, P.S.- Garoul, District- Vaishali.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pranav Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anand Kishore Choudhary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 16-04-2026 Heard Mr. Pranav Kumar Jha, learned counsel

appearing on behalf of the petitioners and Mr. Anand Kishore

Choudhary, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners seek pre-arrest bail in connection
with Jandaha P.S. Case No. 437/2025 registered for the offence
punishable under Section 80, 3(5) of BNS.

3. As per the allegation made in the FIR, after the
marriage of the informant's daughter with one Ranveer Singh,
she was allegedly subjected to a dowry demand of Rs. 5 lakh,
and thereafter, she went missing from her matrimonial home,



leading the informant to suspect that the petitioners have conspired to make her disappear or have killed her.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioners, being in-laws of the victim, were residing separately and there is no specific allegation against them, the allegations being general and omnibus in nature. The Petitioner No.1 is the Father-in-Law (Sasur), Petitioner No.2 is the Mother-in-Law (Saas), Petitioner No.3 and 4 are Brother-In-Law (Bhaisur) of the Victim girl. Learned counsel contends that, as per the materials collected during investigation and the case diary, the victim had left on her own and is still untraceable, and even otherwise, the specific allegations, if any, are against the husband. On these grounds, the petitioners seek to be released on pre-arrest bail.

5. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of pre-arrest bail.

6. Having heard the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties, as well as, having considered the allegations made in the FIR and the materials available on record, it appears that petitioner no.1 is the father-in-law (sasur), petitioner no.2 is the mother-in-law (saas), and petitioner nos.3 and 4 are the



brothers-in-law (bhaisur) of the victim. From the case diary, it also appears that the victim had left her matrimonial home on her own and is still untraceable. Considering the aforesaid facts and the nature of allegations, I am of the opinion that petitioner no. 1 (father-in-law) and petitioner nos. 3 and 4 (brothers-in-law), against whom no specific role has been attributed, have, *prima facie*, made out a case to be released on anticipatory bail.

7. The learned District Court is directed to release the petitioner nos.1, 3 and 4 on anticipatory bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned District Court within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned District Court where the case is pending in connection with Jandaha P.S. Case No. 437/2025, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

8. The learned District Court is directed to verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners, as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail application. If any other case is pending against the petitioners, as what has been stated in paragraph no. 3, this order will lose its force automatically.

9. However, so far as petitioner no. 2, the mother-



in-law of the victim, is concerned, considering her close proximity in the matrimonial household and the possibility of her involvement, I am not inclined to grant her the privilege of anticipatory bail at this stage.

10. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Ashishsingh/-

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

