

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20019 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-77 Year-2006 Thana- BHABHU(KAIMUR) COMPLAIN C
District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

-
1. Ramashish Singh, son of Late Banarasi Singh, Resident of Village - Birna, P.O.- Sikathi, P.S.- Dhansoi, District - Buxar, Bihar
 2. Budhan Singh, Son of Late Banarasi Singh, Resident of Village - Birna, P.O.- Sikathi, P.S.- Dhansoi, District - Buxar, Bihar
 3. Jawala Kumar Singh @ Jawala Singh, Son of Ramashish Singh, Resident of Village - Birna, P.O.- Sikathi, P.S.- Dhansoi, District - Buxar, Bihar
 4. Uttam Kumar Singh, Son of Ramashish Singh, Resident of Village - Birna, P.O.- Sikathi, P.S.- Dhansoi, District - Buxar, Bihar
 5. Praduman Kumar Singh @ Praduman Singh, Son of Ramashish Singh, Resident of Village - Birna, P.O.- Sikathi, P.S.- Dhansoi, District - Buxar, Bihar
 6. Dulari Kumari, Daughter of Ramashish Singh, Resident of Village - Birna, P.O.- Sikathi, P.S.- Dhansoi, District - Buxar, Bihar
 7. Geeta Devi, Wife of Ram Ashish Singh, Resident of Village - Birna, P.O.- Sikathi, P.S.- Dhansoi, District - Buxar, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Raushan Kumar Singh, Son of Late Ram Kripal Singh, Resident of Village - Dihri, P.S.- Kudra, District - Kaimur at Bhabhua.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chandra Mohan Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Kalyan Shankar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

5 16-07-2019 This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail in connection with Complaint Case No. 77 of 2006, disclosing offences under Sections 406 and 499 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 Dowry Prohibition Act.

Allegation against the petitioners is that petitioner no.1 fixed the marriage of petitioner no.3 with the sister of complainant and they have taken Rs.2,00,000/-, but later on, they refused to marry



the petitioner no.3 with his sister and not returning the said amount.
It further appears that the complaint case is of the year 2006.

Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners is that the summons has been issued to the petitioners in year 2008 but petitioners have moved a revision and as such, they have not appeared and even no steps was taken by the complainant and now after issuance of NBW, they appeared and filed this anticipatory bail application before this Court.

Heard learned A.P.P. as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant, also, they have opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail by stating that petitioners have appeared after 12 years of the occurrence.

Having heard both sides, in view of the facts and circumstances, as stated above, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, however, the petitioners may move before the learned court below for regular bail which will be considered by the learned court below, on its own merit, and if possible, be disposed of on the same day.

With the aforesaid, this application is dismissed.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

Sunil Shukla/-

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

