

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRCA No. 56 of 2021**

1. Govind Ram Sahu S/o Budhram Sahu Aged About 56 Years
R/o Quarter No. 22, Ward No. 07, Post Office
Bhanupratappur, District Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh.
2. Smt. Lalita Sahu W/o Govind Ram Sahu Aged About 51
Years R/o Quarter No. 22, Ward No. 07, Post Office
Bhanupratappur, District Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh.
3. Ravikant Sahu S/o Govind Ram Sahu Aged About 29 Years
R/o Quarter No. 22, Ward No. 07, Post Office
Bhanupratappur, District Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer,
Bhanupratappur, District Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicants	:-	Mr. Shivendu Pandya, Advocate
For Respondent-State	:-	Mr. Ravish Verma, G.A.
For Objector	:-	Mr. Sandeep Shrivastava, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra
Order On Board

10/03/2021

1. Heard.
2. The applicants have preferred this bail application for grant of anticipatory bail, as they apprehend their arrest in connection with Crime No.239/2020 registered at Police Station Bhanupratappur, District – Uttar Bastar Kanker C.G. for the offence punishable under Sections 498(A), 506(B)/34 of the I.P.C. and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Applicant No.1 Govind Ram Sahu is father-in-law whereas applicant No.2 Smt. Lalita Sahu is mother-in-law and applicant No.3 Ravikant Sahu is brother-in-law (*devar*) of complainant Kriti Sahu. Complainant was engaged to Bhupendra Sahu on 14.12.2018 and thereafter the marriage took place on 19.4.2019. It is alleged that soon after the marriage the applicants demanded four wheeler and ₹5 Lacs cash from the complainant and upon her failure to satisfy the demand she was subjected to cruelty including unnatural sex by the husband.
4. Learned State counsel would oppose the prayer for grant of bail.
5. On perusal of material available in the case diary it would indicate that the allegation of having unnatural sex is against the husband of the complainant. Similarly, the allegation of criminal intimidation is against applicant No.3 who allegedly purchased a knife from amazon to terrorize the complainant. Although there are allegations of demand of dowry against applicant No.1 Govind Ram Sahu and applicant No.2 Smt. Lalita Sahu but considering that they are the father-in-law and mother-in-law respectively of the complainant and also considering the fact that there is no allegation of criminal intimidation against them, I am inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to applicant No.1 and applicant No.2.
6. Accordingly, anticipatory bail application is **allowed** in respect of applicant No.1 **Govind Ram Sahu** and applicant

No.2 **Smt. Lalita Sahu** and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicants, they shall be released on anticipatory bail on each of them executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the arresting officer with the following conditions:-

- (i) they shall make themselves available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;
- (ii) they 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) the applicants shall not influence the witnesses during pendency of the trial.

7. Considering the allegation against applicant No.3 **Ravikant Sahu**, his application for grant of anticipatory bail is **dismissed**. However, liberty is reserved in his favor to surrender and apply for regular bail. If the applicant surrenders and applies for regular bail, the concerned Court shall consider and decide the bail application on the same day.

SD/-
(**Prashant Kumar Mishra**)
Judge

Ayushi