



2026:AHC-LKO:41412

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 4106 of 2026

Ram Kumar And Another

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Lko

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Abhishek Srivastava, Gaurav
Kumar Tiwari
Counsel for Opposite Party(s): G.A.

Court No. - 11

HON'BLE SUBHASH VIDYARTHI, J.

1. Heard Sri Abhishek Srivastava, learned counsel for the applicants, Smt. Ranjana Srivastava, learned Additional Government Advocate for the State and Sri Nagendra Pratap Singh, Advocate who has put in appearance on behalf of the informant and has filed his vakalatnama, which is taken on record.
2. The instant application has been filed seeking release of the applicants on bail in Case Crime No. 0203 of 2025, under Sections 115(2), 80(2), 85 of B.N.S. and Section 3/4 of D.P. Act, registered at Police Station Mitauli, District Lakhimpur Kheri.
3. The aforesaid case has been registered on the basis of an F.I.R. lodged on the basis of an application filed under Section 173(4) BNSS filed against four persons including the applicants, their son Ranjit Kumar and Akhilesh Kumar stating that the complainant had got his daughter Manorama married to Ranjit Kumar on 20.12.2020. All the accused persons used to harass her for demanding dowry and complainant's daughter had filed a complaint under the Protection of Women From Domestic Violence Act and a settlement was entered into between the parties on 11.06.2024 and thereafter, she went to live in her matrimonial home. All the accused persons had beaten up the victim and administered poison to her on 13.08.2024 and thereby they committed her murder.

4. The postmortem examination was conducted on 14.08.2024.

5. Initially the complainant had given an application dated 14.08.2024 to the police stating that his daughter had got married to the applicants' son Ranjit Kumar about 4 years ago. Rajit Kumar had taken the complainant's daughter to Punjab. On 13.08.2024 the complainant came to know about the sudden death of his daughter. He stated that the dead body of his daughter had been brought from Punjab and was lying in Village Chandpurwa. Upon this application an inquest was carried out on 14.08.2024, wherein some injuries on the dead body were noted. The postmortem examination report mentions an abraded contusion of size 1cm.X1cm. over back of the right mid forearm. It is mentioned in the postmortem examination report that the other injuries mentioned in the inquest report were not found due to decomposition signs. The cause of death could not be ascertained and viscera was preserved. In the viscera examination report, presence of aluminum phosphide was found.

6. In the affidavit filed in support of bail application it has been stated that the applicant no.1 is an 80 years old person and the applicant no.2 is a 75 years old woman, they are innocent, they have been falsely implicated in the present case and they have no criminal history.

7. The learned Additional Government Advocate appearing on behalf of the State has opposed the prayer for bail and he has submitted that the allegations against the applicants have been established during investigation and a charge sheet has been submitted on 28.03.2026.

8. The learned counsel for the complainant has also opposed the prayer for bail and he has submitted that the injuries on the dead body indicate that the victim was harassed and forced to consume poison.

9. Having considered the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and keeping in view the fact that initially information of the death the complainant stated that the deceased died while staying with her

husband at Punjab, whereas the applicants are the father in law and mother in law of the deceased and they reside in their village at Lakhimpur Kheri, prima facie it appears that the deceased consumed or was made to consume some poison in Punjab, where the applicants were not present; that the applicant no.1 is a 80 years old person and applicant no.2 is a 75 years old woman, they have no previous criminal history and they are languishing in jail since 10.03.2026 and the investigation already stands concluded and without making any observation, which may affect the merits of the case, I am of the view that the aforesaid facts are sufficient for making out a case for enlargement of the applicants on bail in the aforesaid crime.

10. Accordingly, this bail application stands **allowed**.

11. Let the **applicants**-Ram Kumar & Smt. Bitauli be released on bail in the aforesaid case on furnishing a personal bond and two sureties each in the like amount to the satisfaction of magistrate/court concerned, subject to following conditions:-

- (i) the applicants shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence;
- (ii) the applicants shall not pressurize the prosecution witnesses;
- (iii) the applicants shall appear on each and every date fixed by the trial court, unless their appearance is exempted by the learned trial court.

June 18, 2026

Ram.

(Subhash Vidyarthi,J.)