

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14260 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-906 Year-2016 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Banka

Kalawati Devi, Wife of Krishnadeo Pandit Resident of Village-
Raghunathpur, P.O. Raghunathpur, P.S.- Barahat, District- Banka.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Gurudeo Kumar Pandit @ Gurudeo Pandit Son of Yogendra Pandit Resident of Village- Raghunathpur, P.S.- Barahat, District- Banka.
3. Nandan Pandit Son of Yogendra Pandit Resident of Village- Raghunathpur, P.S.- Barahat, District- Banka.
4. Sudin Pandit Son of Yogendra Pandit Resident of Village- Raghunathpur, P.S.- Barahat, District- Banka.
5. Tiliya Devi Wife of Yogendra Pandit Resident of Village- Raghunathpur, P.S.- Barahat, District- Banka.
6. Jogendra Pandit Son of Late Chutari Pandit Resident of Village- Raghunathpur, P.S.- Barahat, District- Banka.
7. Pushpa Devi Wife of Sudin Pandit Resident of Village- Raghunathpur, P.S.- Barahat, District- Banka.
8. Ranju Devi Wife of Nandan Pandit Resident of Village- Raghunathpur, P.S.- Barahat, District- Banka.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pancha Nand Pandit, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 26-06-2019 The petitioner, who is the maternal grand-

mother of Peeyush Kumar seeks cancellation of bail of

the opposite parties no. 2 to 8 on the ground that after

they were granted anticipatory bail by order dated



13.12.2018 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 63990 of 2018, they have been threatening the complainant of dire consequences and are also trying to harm her grand-son.

A petition to that effect has also been filed by the petitioner/grand-mother before the court below (Annexure-3).

The opposite parties no. 2 to 8 are not at all related to Sachidanand Pandit, the main accused of the case and father of Peeyush Kumar and there is some relationship of some of the opposite parties with the petitioner. It is because of such relationship that a suspicion is being harboured by the petitioner that they would conspire to harm the boy as Sachidanand Pandit has now been married to a relative of Opposite Party No. 6.

Assuming that these facts are correct, it cannot be presumed that the petitioners are violating anyone of the conditions of the grant of bail or are threatening the petitioner of dire consequences. Though an application



has been filed by the petitioner before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Banka but that cannot be a ground for cancellation of anticipatory bail of opposite parties no. 2 to 8 which was granted to them by order dated 13.12.2018.

The learned advocate appearing for opposite parties has submitted that they are complete outsiders so far as the affairs of Sachidanand Pandit is concerned and merely because a relative of one of the opposite parties has married aforesaid Sachidanand Pandit, the petitioner has directed her ire towards opposite parties no. 2 to 8.

No good ground has been made out by the petitioner for cancellation of anticipatory bail of opposite parties no. 2 to 8. However, opposite parties no. 2 to 8 are cautioned that in case it is reported that they have in any manner tried to harm the boy or threatened the petitioner, it would be viewed very seriously and in that event, this Court would proceed for cancelling the



anticipatory bail of opposite parties no. 2 to 8.

The petition stands dismissed with the aforesaid
direction.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

krishna/-

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

