

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRCA No. 852 of 2020**

1. Pranav Pankaj Sahu, S/o Shri Shyamlal Sahu Aged About 39 Years R/o M.I.G. 66, Housing Board Colony, Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh
Presently Residing At Brno Czech Republic
2. Smt. Swati Puranik W/o Shri Pranav Pankaj Sahu Aged About 37 Years R/o M.I.G. 66, Housing Board Colony, Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh,
Presently Residing At Brno Czech Republic

---- Applicants**Versus**

State of Chhattisgarh through Station House Officer, Police Station Mahila Thana, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.).

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. Sandeep Yadav, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Mr. Ghanshyam Patel, Govt. Advocate
For Objector	:	Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel

Judgment on Board**15/09/2020**

1. The matter is heard through video conferencing.
2. The applicants have filed this application under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail as they are apprehending their arrest in connection with Crime No. 35/2019 registered at police station– Mahila Thana, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 498-A, 34 of the IPC.
3. The applicants are brother-in-law and sister-in-law of the complainant Ankita Sahu. The marriage of the complainant along with Saurabh Sahu was solemnized on 18.02.2018. According to the case of the prosecution on 15.09.2019 the complainant made a report that after her marriage the present applicants and other co-accused persons

used to torture her for demand of dowry worth Rs.25,00,000/-. On the basis of said report, offence has been registered.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants submits that applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. It is submitted that the main allegations are against husband of the complainant. It is next submitted that all other co-accused persons have already granted benefit of anticipatory bail, therefore, he prays to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to applicants.
5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State and counsel for the objector opposes the said application.
6. I have heard counsel for the parties.
7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the argument advanced by counsel for the parties, particularly considering that the main allegation has been made against husband of the complainant and that the other co-accused have already been granted benefit of anticipatory bail, without further commenting on other merit of the case, I am inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to applicants.
8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is allowed.
9. It is directed that in the event of arrest applicants, they shall be released on bail on each of them furnishing a bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety each for the like sum to the satisfaction of the officer arresting them and they shall abide by all the following terms and conditions:
 - i. That, applicants shall make themselves available for interrogation before the concerned Investigating Officer as and

when required;

ii. That, applicants 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

iii. That, applicants shall not act, in any manner, which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial; and

iv. That, applicants shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to them by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

10. Certified copy, as per rules.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge

Yasmin