

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46024 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1232 Year-2017 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Supaul

1. Rajendra Prasad Mehta @ Rajendra Mehta, Son of Late Hibbi Mehta
2. Geeta Devi, Wife of Rajendra Prasad Mehta @ Rajendra Mehta
Both Resident of Village- Kalyanpur, P.S.- Bhaptiyahi, District- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Punam Kumari, Wife of Parmanand Mehta, Daughter of Mahadeo Mehta
Resident of Village- Kalyanpur, P.S.- Bhaptiyahi, District- Supaul.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Arun
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Nirmal Kumar Sinha

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 25-09-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel representing the opposite party no.2.

The petitioners in this case are father-in-law and mother-in-law respectively who are seeking anticipatory bail in connection with Complaint Case No.1232C/17 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498A/323 and 504 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the marriage between opposite party no.2 and the son of these petitioners had taken place on 01.08.2017. The allegation is that after some time while living in the matrimonial home the



opposite party was asked to demand dowry and when she failed to bring dowry then she was being tortured by various means. It is however submitted that these petitioners are the in-laws and they have been implicated in this case only because of the differences between the opposite party no.2 and her husband. So far as these petitioners are concerned, they are living separately in mess and business.

Learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case wherein it is stated that these petitioners are the father-in-law and mother-in-law respectively and because the opposite party no.2 had a grievance with her husband and she was not happy with her marriage so she has falsely implicated these petitioners, let the petitioners above named in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks from today, be enlarged on bail on furnishing of bail bonds of Rs. 15,000/- (fifteen thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned S.D.J.M., Supaul in connection with Complaint Case No.1232C/17, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C. i.e.

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself



available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/-

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

