

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.69339 of 2018

Arising Out of Case No.-391 Year-2013 Thana- Siwan Complaint District- Siwan

=====

Md. Raunaque Siddiqui @ Raunak Siddiqui, Son of Rashid Siddiqui @ Abdul Rasid, Resident of Village-Sheikh Mohalla, Churi Mandi, P.S.-Siwan Town, District-Siwan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Yashmin Praveen, D/o Jalalluddin Khan, Wife of Raunak Siddiqui at Present Resident of Village-Bishambharpur, P.S.-Pachrukhi, District-Siwan.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Pandey
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Ram Priya Saran Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-12-2018 The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Complaint Case No. 391 of 2013 registered under Sections 498A of the Indian penal Code.

Allegation against the petitioner is of torturing his wife in connection with demand of dowry.

It appears that petitioner was earlier granted anticipatory bail with condition that he will pay Rs. 750/- per month by 15th of each month and later on, he failed to keep his promise and as such his anticipatory bail bond was cancelled. It further appears that thereafter petitioner has moved for quashing of the case and that was disposed of with following terms:

“Considering that the petitioner is ready to pay a sum of Rs. 11 lacs by way of demand draft payable to the



Opposite Party No. 2 as interim arrangement without prejudice to case of either parties, let him do so within a period of four months.

On payment of the said amount by way of demand draft within the aforesaid period, the provisional anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner shall stand confirmed in connection with Complaint Case No. 391 of 2013 pending before the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Siwan.”

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner is paying the maintenance amount as per direction of the family Court in Maintenance Case No. M-102/2014 and as such he could not deposit Rs. 11 lacs as interim arrangement and petitioner is in custody since 25.09.2018.

Heard learned APP as well as learned counsel for the O.P. No. 2, who have opposed the prayer of bail stating that maintenance amount is also not being paid regularly and further he has violated the terms and conditions after grant of bail and as such he does not deserve bail.

Having heard both sides and in the facts and circumstances, as stated above, let the petitioner, abovenamed, be released on bail upon furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned ACJM-III, Siwan in connection with Complaint P.S. Case No. 391 of 2013 with



condition that he will regularly pay the maintenance amount to the O.P. No. 2, as directed by the family court in the maintenance case.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

sujit/-

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

