

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31803 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-7 Year-2026 Thana- RAFIGANJ District- Aurangabad

1. Amrita Kumari W/O Dhananjay Yadav R/O Village- Dhamni, PS-Haspura, Distt-Aurangabad
2. Dhananjay Yadav S/O Late Nandu Yadav R/O Village- Dhamni, PS-Haspura, Distt-Aurangabad
3. Guddu Yadav @ Guddu Kumar S/O Late Nandu Yadav R/O Village- Dhamni, PS-Haspura, Distt-Aurangabad
4. Munna Yadav @ Munna Kumar S/O Late Nandu Yadav R/O Village- Dhamni, PS-Haspura, Distt-Aurangabad
5. Sabita Devi W/O Raviranjana Kumar R/O Village- Dhamni, PS-Haspura, Distt-Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                     |   |                                |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| For the Petitioners | : | Ms. Mukul Kumari, Advocate     |
| For the State       | : | Ms. Pushpa Sinha, APP          |
| For the Informant   | : | Ms. Leelawati Kumari, Advocate |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      17-06-2026                      Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned A.P.P. for the State as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Rafiganj P.S. Case No. 07 of 2026 for allegedly having committed offences under Sections 80 and 3(5) of B.N.S., 2023.

3. As per the prosecution story, which has been lodged on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant, to the effect that the marriage of his daughter was solemnized on



25.05.2019 with Bindeshwar Yadav. In the marriage, he gave dowry and other articles as per his capacity, however the daughter of the informant was subjected to cruelty on account of non-fulfillment of demand of dowry by her husband and his family members. They used to demand a tractor from the daughter of the informant and due to non-fulfillment of the demand, she was killed by the accused persons on 05.01.2026.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that although the date of occurrence is 05.01.2026, but the First Information Report was lodged on 07.01.2026 and no explanation whatsoever has been given for the delay in lodging the First Information Report. It is further submitted that petitioner no.1 is the *Gotni*, petitioner no.2 is the elder brother of the husband of the deceased, while petitioners no.3 and 4 are the brothers-in-law (*Devar*) and petitioner no.5 is the married sister-in-law (*Nanad*) of the deceased. It is submitted that the husband of the deceased has himself informed the informant about the death of his daughter and the daughter of the informant was suffering from epilepsy, due to which she fell down from the bed and sustained injuries resulting into her death. It is further submitted that even the post mortem report does not support the allegations levelled in the First Information



Report and the allegation of demand of tractor is entirely false.

5. *Per Contra*, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that the petitioners and their family members have killed the daughter of the informant for dowry and the post mortem report suggests multiple injuries on her body. It is further submitted that even the husband of the deceased is absconding till date.

6. The learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners by submitting that the petitioners and their family members connived and killed the daughter of the informant.

7. Having considered the rival submissions and after going through the records and the case diary, which is available on record, it would transpire that the daughter of the informant died in her matrimonial home and the post mortem report suggests that there were several injuries on the body of the deceased, including the fracture of cervical vertebrae C2 and C3. It has further been opined by the doctor, who conducted the post-mortem on the dead body of the deceased, that spinal cord inside cervical vertebrae were crushed and blood clott present above and below crush injury. Brain matter lacerated and blood eloff present inside cranial cavity posterior region of brain. It



further appears from the case diary that the witnesses have supported the case of the informant.

8. Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners is hereby rejected.

**(Ritesh Kumar, J.)**

*Sanjay/-*

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

