

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39799 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-105 Year-2026 Thana- MUFFASIL District- West Champaran

1. Md. Laddan @ Md. Ladan S/o Late Asgar Ali Resident of Village - Mansha Tola, Ward No.- 32, P.S. - Bettiah (Muffasil), District - West Champaran
2. Munni Khatoon @ Mumtaj Khatoon W/o Md. Laddan @ Md. Ladan Resident of Village - Mansha Tola, Ward No.- 32, P.S. - Bettiah (Muffasil), District - West Champaran
3. Gulafash Khatoon @ Laddo Dokhtar @ Lado D/o Md Laddan @ Md. Ladan Resident of Village - Mansha Tola, Ward No.- 32, P.S. - Bettiah (Muffasil), District - West Champaran
4. Md Altamas @ Altamas S/o Md Laddan @ Md. Ladan Resident of Village - Mansha Tola, Ward No.- 32, P.S. - Bettiah (Muffasil), District - West Champaran
5. Guriya Dokhtar @ Mahavish Gajal @ Gudiya D/o Md Laddan @ Md. Ladan Resident of Village - Mansha Tola, Ward No.- 32, P.S. - Bettiah (Muffasil), District - West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bimlesh Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Murli Dhar, A.P.P.
For the Informant : Mr. Avinash Raj, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 25-06-2026

1. Heard Mr. Bimlesh Kumar Pandey, learned counsel

for the petitioners, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80 and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and petitioners no.



2, 3 and 5 are women and the informant alleges that his daughter was married to Md. Mashkur in October, 2019 and after one year of marriage, the husband along with his family members started torturing the victim for dowry demand of Rs.5 lakhs. However, by Panchayati the issue was settled temporarily. Further, the victim gave birth to a son and a daughter thereafter again dowry demand of Rs.5 lakhs started. It is next alleged that on 04.03.2026 at 10:00 p.m. the victim informed the informant that accused persons may kill her for non-fulfillment of dowry demand. Thereafter, on 06.03.2026, the informant received an information at 07:00 a.m. that victim was strangulated to death, accordingly, he reached the place of occurrence and saw that her in-laws were preparing for her burial.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the deceased was married to Md. Mashkur in the year 2019 and the instant FIR came to be instituted in the year 2026, i.e., after more than six and half years of marriage. It is next submitted that in between these six and half years, no case ever came to be instituted either by the deceased or the informant alleging



torture on account of non-fulfillment of dowry demand. It is also submitted that informant is not an eye-witness to the occurrence and the allegation of demand of dowry and torture is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that if the victim on 04.03.2026 had called the informant and informed that she apprehends that accused persons would kill her for non-fulfillment of dowry demand then why the informant did not immediately rush to the matrimonial home of his daughter which amply demonstrates that no such disclosure was made by the victim to the informant as the informant alleges that on 06.03.2026, he received an information that the victim has been strangled to death which amply demonstrates that the informant did not go to the matrimonial home of the victim on 04.03.2026 and 05.03.2026. It is next submitted that cause of death has been opined to be asphyxia on account of hanging which amply demonstrates that victim committed suicide. It is also submitted that whenever any dispute arises in between the husband and the wife and the occurrence of the nature as alleged takes place, the entire family members are implicated in a mechanical manner with general and omnibus allegation. It is further submitted that had the petitioners been involved in the



occurrence then efforts would have been made to dispose of the dead body with a view to conceal the evidence but then the dead body was sent for postmortem for ascertaining the cause of death and the Doctor opined asphyxia on account of hanging as a cause of death. It is next submitted that sisters of the husband of the deceased have also been made an accused who are of marriageable age. It is also submitted that if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioners, the petitioners will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove their innocence.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners but then are not in a position to rebut the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners that informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence and the cause of death is not strangulation and if the victim had disclosed to the informant on 04.03.2026 that the accused persons may kill her then why he did not rush immediately to the matrimonial home of the victim.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, let the petitioners, above-named, in the event of their arrest or



surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Bettiah (Mufassil) P.S. Case No. 105 of 2026, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

7. However, it is made clear that if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned Trial Court bringing to its notice that the petitioners, despite giving assurance to this Court, are not cooperating in the investigation, the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioners.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

