

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
(FROM RESIDENTIAL OFFICE VIA VIDEO APPLICATION)
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17544 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1210 Year-2005 Thana- BHAGALPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Bhagalpur

-
1. Mishri Manjhi @ Mishri Prasad Manjhi Son of Late Devan Ram Manjhi Resident of Jharna Colony, P.S. Borio, District Sahibganj (Jharkhand), at Present, C/O Awdhesh Sharma, P.S. Zereabari, District - Sahibganj.
 2. Kamla Devi @ Lelawati Devi Wife of Mishri Prasad Manjhi Resident of Jharna Colony, P.S. Borio, District Sahibganj (Jharkhand), at Present, C/O Awdhesh Sharma, P.S. Zereabari, District - Sahibganj.
 3. Shyam Prasad Manjhi Son of Mishri Manjhi Resident of Jharna Colony, P.S. Borio, District Sahibganj (Jharkhand), at Present, C/O Awdhesh Sharma, P.S. Zereabari, District - Sahibganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR
2. Smt. Bandana Devi Wife of Ram Prasad Manjhi Daughter of Bhuneshwar Sahani, Mohalla Jharna Colony, P.S. Borio, District Sahibganj (Jharkhand), at Present Mohalla, Jhangira, P.S. Sultanganj, District - Sahibganj.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Md. Nazir Ansari, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Akbar Ali, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER**

4 02-09-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP
for the State.

Petitioners in the present case are seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with Complaint Case No.C1210 of 2005 registered for the offence punishable under Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner no.1 is the father-in-law, petitioner no.2 is the mother-in-



law and petitioner no.3 is Dewar of the complainant and entire family have falsely been implicated in this case because they are kith and kin of the husband of the complainant. Learned counsel submits that there is no specific allegation against the petitioners and petitioners have no concern with the husband of the complainant as they are separate in mess and business.

Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for pre-arrest bail of the petitioners.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case that the petitioners are seeking pre-arrest bail in the present case which is of the year 2005 and in which cognizance was taken in the year 2006 and presently process under Section 83 Cr.P.C. has already been issued against them, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Prayer is, thus, refused.

In case the petitioners appear in the learned court below within a period of four weeks from today and pray for regular bail, their prayer for regular bail shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by the present order of this Court.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/-

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

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

