

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRCA No. 882 of 2020**

1. Babita Singh W/o Ajay Singh, aged about 45 years R/o KLC Khurseepar, Bhilai, District Durg (C.G.).
2. Sangeeta Singh W/o Mahesh Singh, aged about 40 years R/o Khurseepar, Bhilai, District Durg (C.G.)

---- Applicants**Versus**

State of Chhattisgarh through SHO Mahila Thana Durg, District Durg (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicants : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Agrawal, Advocate
 For Respondent : Mr. Alok Nigam, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel**Order on Board****23/09/2020**

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. 33/2020 registered at police station – Mahila Thana, District Durg (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 498-A/34 of the IPC.
3. The applicants are sisters-in-law of the Complainant. The marriage between the Complainant and co-accused Mukesh was solemnized in the year 2017. On 11/06/2020, an FIR has been lodged by the Complainant alleging therein that after some time of the marriage, the applicants and co-accused Mukesh tortured her and treated her with

cruelty on account of dowry. Initially in the year 2018, she made a complaint and at that time counseling proceeding was conducted, and compromise has been taken place between both the parties. Despite of the compromise, her husband did not take her with him. On the basis of above report, offence has been registered.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants submits that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. There are general allegations against the applicants. The main allegations are against co-accused Mukesh who is husband of the Complainant. Other co-accused mother-in-law of the Complainant has already granted bail by the Sessions Court itself. He prays to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicants.
5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the said application.
6. I have heard counsel for the parties.
7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, argument advanced by counsel for the parties and further considering that the applicants are sisters-in-law of the Complainant, there are general allegations against them, main allegation is against co-accused Mukesh and other co-accused has already been granted bail by the Sessions Court, without further commenting on other merit of the case, I am inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicants.
8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is allowed.
9. It is directed that in the event of arrest, the applicants shall be released

on bail on each of them furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/- with one surety 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, the accused/applicants shall make themselves available for interrogation before the concerned Investigating Officer as and when required;
- ii. The accused/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. The accused/applicant shall not act, in any manner, which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial; and
- iv. The applicant 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