

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39294 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-26 Year-2022 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Buxar

Ranjeet Kumar @ Bablu Son of Shree Shankar Prasad Sah Resident of - Kant,
P.S.- Brahmpur, District - Buxar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Khusbu Kumari Daughter of Bharat Jee Prasad Resident of - Dhansoi, P.S.-
Dhansoi, District - Buxar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 1 07-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

Let the defects, as pointed out by the office, be removed within a period of four weeks from today.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 498(A), 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

According to prosecution case, Informant Khushboo Kumari was married with Ranjeet Kumar, Petitioner on 23.04.2019 as per Hindu rites and Rituals. Everything was right for about three months. Earlier her husband was a Group-D employee in the Railway, and accordingly the father of the informant had given Rs. 10,00,000/- cash & articles costing around Rs. 6,00,000/-. But informant heard that her husband has been promoted from Group-D to Guard. From then, the accused



persons namely Hewanti Devi (mother-in-law), Ranjeet Kumar (husband), Satyam Kumari (sister-in-law) & Sandeepan Kumar (brother-in-law) started demanding a Swift Dezire Car, priced around Rs. 9,00,000/- as dowry from informant's side. But the informant expressed her father's inability to fulfill their demand, due to which the accused persons started mentally & physically torturing her, and told her that they will marry their son with another girl for more dowry. On 19.12.2020 accused persons assaulted her, then informant informed her brother and got her treatment at Sadar Hospital Ara. After treatment, when she went to her matrimonial home, but accused persons ousted her and told her that she is not required in the house anymore. Then, she anyhow along with her brother came at her parental house. On 02.01.2022 she filed a petition before Sarpanch of Gram Kant of matrimonial home, but even after they were not ready to keep her.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that due to one petty issue the present FIR has been filed against the petitioner. He further submits that in fact the informant wants to live with her husband at his work place but the petitioner wants to live the informant in her matrimonial home. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is ready to keep the informant at his work place with full honour and dignity considering the aforesaid facts. Learned counsel for the informant fairly submits that she is ready to live with the petitioner at his work place.

The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, let



the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Buxar (Mahila) P.S. Case No. 26 of 2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. and also the following conditions:-

1. One of the bailors should be the informant Khushboo Kumari, daughter of Shri Bharadwaj Jee Prasad, wife of Ranjeet Kumar alias Bablu.

2. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

3. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

4. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order



shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of
verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

sandeep/-

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

