

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.40491 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -24 Year- 2017 Thana -PANDAUL District- MADHUBANI

=====

1. Guriya Khatoon, wife of Chhedi Nadaf,
2. Manzoor Nadaf, Son of Late Chulhai Nadaf,
3. Md. Jahangir @ Jahangir Nadaf, S/o Chhedi Nadaf @ Md. Chhedi Nadaf,

All resident of Village- Jamsun Kua Tole, P.S.- Pandaul, District- Madhubani.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav

For the Opposite Party/s : Smt. Sahin Begam

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 19-09-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel for the State.

The petitioners seek anticipatory bail in a case instituted for the offences under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The dispute arose on account of settling the marriage with the son of one Chhedi Nadaf. On the fateful day Chhedi Nadaf was assaulting the son of the informant. The informant protested. When the informant and his family members were returning Chhedi Nadaf and other accused persons were waiting from them. Chhedi Nadaf proceeded to catch the husband of the informant and other accused persons surrounded him. Specific



allegation has been made against Chhedi Nadaf to have caused injury by the blunt portion of spade on his head and later on he died. Petitioner no.1 is a lady.

Looking to the facts and circumstances of the case, in the event of arrest or surrender within four weeks from today, let petitioner no.1, namely, Guriya Khatoon, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Madhubani in connection with Pandaul P.S. Case No.24 of 2017, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

So far petitioner nos. 2, namely Manzoor Nadaf and Md. Jahangir alias Jahangir Nadaf are concerned, this Court is not inclined to enlarge them on anticipatory bail. Accordingly their prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Vinay/-

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

