

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16516 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-661 Year-2019 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

-
1. CHANDRASHEKHAR SINGH Son of Prabhakar Singh Resident of Village - Lodipur, P.S.- Bind, District - Naladna
 2. Prabhakar Kumar Son of Late Sato Singh Resident of Village - Lodipur, P.S.- Bind, District - Naladna
 3. Manorama Devi Wife of Prabhakar Singh Resident of Village - Lodipur, P.S.- Bind, District - Naladna
 4. Kajal Devi Wife of Chandrashekhhar Singh Resident of Village - Lodipur, P.S.- Bind, District - Naladna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Gunjan Kumari Wife of Sankatmochan Singh R/o - Lodipur, P.S.- Bind, District - Naladna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Manoj Kumar Pandey
		Ms. Kumari Pallavi
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Madan Kumar, APP
		Mr. Kumar Sameer

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

5 30-08-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioners is directed to remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the complainant.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest for the offences alleged under Sections 323 and 498A of the Indian Penal Code, registered in connection with Complaint Case No.



661 of 2019.

As per allegation, the complainant was married to the son of petitioner no.1 in 2017. Her husband took her to his working place in Faridabad, but after leaving her he fled away. The complainant came to her matrimonial home where the accused persons demanded Rs. two lakhs in dowry. There is allegation against the mother-in law and *gotni* of the complainant that they snatched her ornaments.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that petitioner no.1 is father-in-law, petitioner no.2 is brother-in-law, petitioner no.3 is mother-in-law and petitioner no.4 is unmarried *nanad* of the complainant. They have no concern with the dowry demand or day-to-day affair of the couple. They have been made accused merely because they are close relatives of the husband of the complainant.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that there is allegation against the petitioners that they were demanding Rs. two lakhs in dowry.

There is specific allegation against the husband that after marriage he brought the complainant to Faridabad and after deserting her he fled away. The petitioners are other than



the husband and they have no concern with day-to-day affairs with the couple.

Considering the above facts and circumstances, let the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within four weeks from the date of communication of this order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/-(ten thousand) each, with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Sri P.K.Tiwari J.M. 1st Class, Barh, Patna in connection with Complaint Case No. 661 of 2019, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) Cr. P.C.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioners within the stipulated time as provided hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

