

(2026) 01 JH CK 1795
In the Jharkhand High Court
Case No : A.B.A. No. 5704 Of 2025

Kiran Kumar Sharma

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Jharkhand

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 13-01-2026

Acts Referred:

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 — Section 3(5), 74, 76, 77, 79, 85, 109, 115(2),
126(2), 127(2), 351(2), 351(3)
Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 498A

Citation : (2026) 01 JH CK 1795

Hon'ble Judges : Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Kumar Harsh, Bishambhar Shastri, Zaid Ahmed

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J

1. Heard learned counsels for petitioner and for State.
2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Dhanbad Mahila PS Case No.06 of 2025, for offence registered under sections 115(2), 126(2), 127(2), 109, 74, 76, 77, 351(2) and (3), 79, 85 and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023, pending in court of learned Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Dhanbad.
3. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that the petitioner nos.1 happened to be the husband of the informant, and the petitioner nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, happened to be the father-in-law, mother-in-law, sister-in-law, sister-in-law and brother-in-law, respectively, of the informant. He further submits that the entire family members have been made accused in the instant case and false allegations are made of torture against the petitioners. He next submits that the allegations are made of installing CCTV cameras in the wash-room as well as in the bed-room, however, it is not correct. He then submits that the CCTV cameras have been installed outside the house for protection of the family. He next

submits that prior to this also, the informant has lodged the complaint case under section 498A and other sections of the IPC on 9.8.2024 which is still pending. He next submits that the informant has filed the Original Maintenance Case No.609 of 2024 for maintenance and in that case, the prayer was made to the effect that the informant will reside along with the petitioners. He then submits that false allegations are made and the entire family members have been made accused in the instant case.

4. Learned State counsel as well as the learned counsel for the informant/OP No.2 oppose the prayer and submit that allegations are there of installation of CCTV cameras and assault as well as demand of dowry and the allegation of molestation is made against the brother-in-law and in view of that, they submit that the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners may kindly be rejected.

5. Looking to the contents of the complaint petition, it transpires that there are general and omnibus allegations against all the family members of torture and demand of dowry. The allegation is also made of installation of CCTV cameras in the bed-room and the wash-room, however, in paragraph no.18 of the case diary, it has come that the CCTV cameras have been installed outside the room of the informant, however, it is not disclosed that the CCTV camera is installed in the bed-room as well as in the wash-room as alleged in the complaint petition. If the CCTV cameras are installed, every act of the accused persons will also be captured in the said CCTV cameras and prior to this case, one another complaint case was filed under section 498A as well as under other sections of the IPC on 09.8.2024.

6. In the aforesaid background, the petitioners, above named, are directed to surrender before the learned court concerned within two weeks from today and the learned concerned court shall release the petitioners, above named, on such terms and conditions as well as the sureties, as the learned court concerned may deem fit and proper.

7. This petition, being A.B.A. No.5704 of 2025, is disposed of.