

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38404 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-56 Year-2026 Thana- SUPAUL District- Supaul

1. Umesh Sah S/o Prayag Sah R/o Hardi, Ward No. 8, P.S. -Supaul, Dist. - Supaul.
2. Rubi Devi @ Jaukha Wali W/o Umesh Sah R/o Hardi, Ward No. 8, P.S. -Supaul, Dist. - Supaul,

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dhananjay Kumar Tiwary, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 24-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the

learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection
with Supaul P.S. Case No. 56 of 2026, registered under Sections
103(1), 80, 238, 3(5) of B.N.S.

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 with co-accused Manish Sah almost nine months
ago. After two months of marriage, all the accused persons,
including the petitioners started demanding and pressurizing the



daughter of the informant for the dowry. When the daughter of the informant informed him about the demand of dowry to the tune of Rs. 2,00,000/- and one Apache motorcycle, the informant tried to pacify the matter. It was also informed by his daughter that the accused persons are also not providing food and other basic necessities to her. The informant went to the matrimonial home of his daughter several times, to convince the accused persons and expressed his inability to fulfill their demands. While the informant was at Tatanagar in Jharkhand in connection with his job, on 23.01.2026 at about 06:32 P.M., he received an information on his mobile phone that his daughter has sustained electric shock, while using T.V. and has been admitted at Sadar Hospital, Supaul. When the informant went to the hospital, he was informed that her daughter has already died and the accused persons have already performed her last rituals.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner no. 1 is the father-in-law and the petitioner no. 2 is the mother-in-law of the deceased. He submits that general and omnibus allegations have been leveled against all the accused persons, including the petitioners of demand of dowry and no specific allegation has been leveled against any of the accused persons, including the petitioners. He further submits that during



course of investigation it has come that the deceased and her husband used to quarrel and her husband was a drug addict, therefore, she has committed suicide by hanging herself. The petitioners were residing separately. She committed suicide, since her door was found to be closed from inside. He further submits that the petitioners have got a clean antecedent.

5. *Per contra*, the leaned APP appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that the daughter of the informant has been killed by petitioners and others and the statement of witnesses recorded during investigation as well as the post-mortem report, supports the allegations leveled in the FIR.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and after going through the record, case diary and the post-mortem report appended thereto, it would transpire that the doctor, who conducted post-mortem found 40-50% burn injuries on her face, chest and other parts of the body and further ligature mark was also present and the ante-mortem injuries were found to be grievous to life and were caused by hard and blunt substance. Considering the post-mortem report and the statement of the witnesses in the case diary, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



7. Accordingly the anticipatory bail petition is hereby
rejected.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

shital/-

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

