

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18036 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-12 Year-2021 Thana- DANAPUR RPF POST District- Bhojpur

MANORMA DEVI W/o Surendra Prasad (Wrongly mentioned in F.I.R. as Late Surendra Prasad), Resident of Village/ Mohalla- Jairam Bazar, P.s.- Khagaul, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vibhuti Ranjan Sonvadra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Amitesh Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 26-09-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 3 R.P. (U.P.) Act.

The informant alleges that one Pintu Kumar was apprehended who disclosed that he commits theft of railway property and sells to the petitioner, accordingly, the shop of the petitioner was raided from where 5 kg wire of the railway was recovered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman, it is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation it would



manifest that informant was not found at her shop, it is next submitted that from tenor of allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. it would manifest that the daughter-in-law of the petitioner was at the shop when the alleged recovery is said to have been made but then the seizure list does not bear the signature of the daughter-in-law of the petitioner which creates doubt with regard to the veracity of the allegation as alleged. Learned counsel next submits that the shop belongs to the father-in-law of the petitioner and the shop is running for the last more than 50 years and no complaint ever came to be instituted but since the police always demands money which the petitioner is not in a position to part as such she has been implicated in a false case for which she had also petitioned the Director General of R.P.F., bringing to his notice about the said fact (Annexure -2 series to the anticipatory bail application).

Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

Be that as it may, the petitioner above-named, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount



each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with R.P.F. Danapur P.S. Case No. 12 of 2021 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

gauravkr/-

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

