



2026:AHC:60116

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

**CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No.
- 2772 of 2026**

Jugraj Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s) : Rajan Kumar Pal, Rajeev Upadhyay
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 72

HON'BLE RAJIV LOCHAN SHUKLA, J.

1. Learned counsel for the applicant; learned A.G.A. for the State are present; and Sri Anurag Mishra, learned counsel for the informant.

2. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the applicant in Case No.261 of 2026, arising out of Case Crime No. 251 of 2025, under Sections 80(2), 85 of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, Police Station – Sandipanghat, District Kaushambi, with a prayer to enlarge her on anticipatory bail, till the conclusion of the trial.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant states that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and seeks anticipatory bail on the following grounds :-

i. The applicant is the father-in-law of the deceased, who was married to his younger son.

ii. The First Information Report (FIR) contains only general allegations against the applicant.

iii. The applicant is an old man aged about 54 years and has no criminal antecedents.

iv. The husband of the deceased is already in jail, and the case of the applicant is distinguishable from that of the husband of the deceased.

v. The applicant was granted interim protection by this Court during investigation vide order dated 01.12.2025 passed in **Criminal Misc. Writ Petition No.26960 of 2025**.

4. Learned A.G.A. and the learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and have stated that the applicant and the deceased, along with the husband of the deceased, used to reside together. A couple of days prior to the incident, the applicant, his wife, and the husband of the deceased had allegedly assaulted the deceased, which is supported by the statements of the Village Pradhan, Pushpa Devi, and other witnesses. The statement of an independent villager, Ramesh Singh, indicates that a couple of days before the incident, when the assault on the deceased took place, the witness and other villagers had intervened and pacified the dispute. It is thus contended that soon before her death, the deceased was subjected to cruelty. The Learned A.G.A. has also submitted that anticipatory bail application of the similarly situated co-accused Uma Devi (mother-in-law of the deceased) has also been rejected by this Court vide its order dated 20.3.2026 passed in **CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 2445 of 2026 (Uma Devi Vs. State of U.P. and Another)**.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the Learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record.

6. The applicant is the father-in-law of the deceased and has been named in the FIR. The marriage of the deceased with the younger son of the applicant took place on 16.02.2025, and the death took place on 6.11.2025, i.e., within nine months of the marriage. There are general allegations of demand of dowry in the form of cash, a motorcycle and a buffalo. During investigation, the police recorded statements of villagers who have attested to the fact that the applicant and his wife used to reside with the deceased and her husband and that about two days prior to the incident, the applicant, along with other co-accused, his wife and the husband of the deceased, had assaulted the deceased. Anticipatory bail application of the similarly situated co-accused Uma Devi (mother-in-law of the deceased) has also been rejected by this Court vide its order dated

20.3.2026 passed in **CRIMINAL MISC. ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION U/S 482 BNSS No. - 2445 of 2026** (*Uma Devi Vs. State of U.P. and Another*).

7. It is not for this Court, at this stage, to examine whether there were any visible injuries from the said assault; however, the independent villagers, who are said to have intervened in the dispute, have corroborated the allegations of cruelty levelled in the FIR.

8. In view of the facts and circumstances discussed above, I do not deem it appropriate to enlarge the applicant on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application is **dismissed**.

9. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are solely for the purpose of deciding the present anticipatory bail application and shall not be construed as an opinion on the merits of the case.

(Rajiv Lochan Shukla,J.)

March 23, 2026

Sachin