

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37385 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-35 Year-2026 Thana- Mau District- Gaya

ANIRUDH KUMAR @ ANRUDH KUMAR @ ANIRUDH SHARMA S/O
BIRENDRA PRASAD R/o vill - Mahuari, P.S.- Mau, Distt.- Gaya Ji

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rakesh Kumar S/o Late Rajeshwer Singh R/o vill - Ular, P.O. - Bharatpura,
P.S.- Dulhin Bazar, Distt.- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ashutosh Tripathy
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anish Chandra

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 17-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Mau PS Case No. 35 of 2026 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 80, 238 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that his daughter was married to Priyaranjan on 21-4-
2024, after marriage accused persons including the petitioner
started demanding dowry of Rs. 5 lakh and on account of non-
fulfillment of the demand, the victim was tortured both



physically and mentally, further on 11-3-2026 informant contacted the victim but the victim did not complain but on 12-3-2026 the informant was informed that his daughter has been killed and body was cremated.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that the informant is not an eye-witness to the occurrence and from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that allegation of demand of dowry and torture is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that petitioner being father-in-law came to be implicated with general and omnibus allegation.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that marriage of the victim with Priyaranjan was performed on 21-4-2024 and victim died within seven year of marriage, as such presumption in law also is against the husband of the deceased and his family members. It is also submitted that if the petitioner and his family members were not involved in the occurrence then why the dead body of the deceased was cremated and was not sent for postmortem, which amply demonstrates that the dead body was cremated only with an intent to conceal



evidence. It is further submitted that had the dead body been sent to postmortem, the real cause of death could have surfaced. It is next submitted that it is not possible for the husband to alone cremate the dead body without the support of the family members. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is continuing.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

