

12/06/2026
D/L – 18
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 1292 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Goghat P.S case no. 494 of 2025 dated 04/11/2025 under section 85/326(g)/118(2)/123/109 of the BNS and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, adding Sections 80/103(1)/64(2)(m) of the BNS and 6(1) of the POCSO Act and Section 9 of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act.

In the matter of: XXX & Anr.

...Petitioners.

Mr. N.S. Ghosh
Ms. Laboni Sikder
Mr. Souvik Dey

...for the petitioners.

Mr. Pritam Roy

...for the State.

1. Report filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.
2. Despite service, no one appears on behalf of the de-facto complainant.
3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. The petitioners are the parents-in-law of the alleged victim lady. Earlier, the brother-in-law and the wife of the brother-in-law of the victim were granted anticipatory bail. The petitioners are in no way connected with the alleged offences. The couple stayed separately. The principal accused being the husband of the victim has already been arrested.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He relies on the statements of witnesses, the post-

mortem report and the dying declaration of the alleged victim. He submits that an underage girl was given in marriage to the co-accused. Thereafter, she was tortured. According to a statement, pursuant to such torture made by the husband and the in-laws, she had to consume poison and was treated at a hospital. Thereafter, when the victim lady was sleeping at her parental home with her brother, the husband came with petrol and set them on fire. The two succumbed to their injuries, subsequently. The victim was married to the son of the petitioners at the age of 13 years.

5. This is a gruesome case of double murder. The allegations to set the victim on fire against the husband. However, as against the parents-in-law, there is a statement of the father of the victim that on an earlier occasion, poison was poured on mouth of the victims by the husband and the parents-in-law. At page 244 of the case diary, copy of the relevant bed head ticket for treatment of the victim on such earlier occasion for parakeet poisoning is available.
6. In view of the above, it cannot be said that the parents-in-law of the alleged victim stand on the same footing as the brother-in-law and the wife of the brother-in-law of the alleged victim, who were granted anticipatory bail by this Court earlier.

7. Considering the above, the other incriminating materials available in the case diary and the alleged roles ascribed to the present petitioners, I do not consider this to be a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.
8. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)