

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31714 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-35 Year-2026 Thana- Panapur District- Muzaffarpur

1. Bharti Devi W/o Alok Kumar R/o Village - Raushan Panapur, PS.- Panapur Kariyat, District - Muzaffarpur.
2. Alok Kumar S/o Late Chandeshwar Singh R/o Village - Raushan Panapur, PS.- Panapur Kariyat, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. P.N. Sahi, Sr. Advocate
	:	Mr. Madhukar Anand
	:	Mr. Shubham Kumar Singh
For the Informant	:	Mr. Upendra Kumar Chaubey
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Surendra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 09-07-2026 Heard learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners,

learned counsel for the informant and learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Panapur Kariyat P.S. Case No. 35 of 2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 80(2), 3(5) of BNS.

3. According to prosecution case, the informant namely Nandlal Pandey in his computer typed complaint inter alia alleges that her daughter namely Babli Kumari got married with Akash Kumar @ Ranu on 21-04-2024. He further alleges that at the time of marriage he had given gifts as per his capacity, but after four months of marriage, his son-in-law 1. Akash Kumar @ Ranu, 2. Father-in-law Alok Kumar, 3. Mother-in-law Bharti Devi, 4. Rupali Devi and 5. Sakshi Devi, W/o Tishu Thakur started demanding Rs. 10,00,000/- for



business and on non-fulfillment of their demand, they started threatening and harassing his daughter. He further alleges that after getting information about the same from his daughter, he along with co-villagers Vinod thakur, Bharat Thakur, Kashinath and Ratnesh Kumar tried to pacify the things and also showed his incapacity. He further alleges that on 07-03-2026, his son-in-law informed him, that health of his daughter is in bad state and she is being taken to hospital, after which he along with his villagers went to matrimonial house of his daughter and saw that his daughter is laying dead and there was scar on her neck. He further asserts that her daughter has been murdered by above named persons by strangulating her for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have clean antecedent and they have falsely been implicated in the present case merely on the ground that petitioners are mother-in-law and father-in-law of the deceased. It is next submitted that from perusal of the FIR it appears that there is no specific allegation of assault or overt act or demand of dowry is attributed against the petitioners rather the allegations are general and omnibus in nature. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners further submits that son of the



petitioners, namely, Akash Kumar, who is happened to be the husband of the deceased, is in custody since 09.03.2026.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that petitioners are named in the FIR and they have participated in the present crime in question.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the fact that petitioners have clean antecedent and they are in-laws of the deceased and there is no specific allegation against the petitioners in the FIR and son of the petitioners, who is happened to be the husband of the deceased, is in custody since 09.03.2026, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of 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) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Court No.V, Muzaffarpur (West) in connection with Panapur Kariyat P.S. Case No. 35 of 2026, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(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 their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioners tamper 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)

Gaurav Sinha/-

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

