

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.458 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1759 Year-2015 Thana- SAMASTIPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Samastipur

=====

MANIKANT SHUKLA @ BABLU SHUKLA @ MANIKANT SUKLA @
BABLU SUKLA S/O VIJAY SHUKLA R/o village- Koari Chowk, P.S.-
Gangabridge, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. ARTI DEVI W/O MANIKANT SHUKLA @ BABLU SHUKLA R/o
village- Koari Chowk, P.S.- Gangabridge, District- Vaishali, D/o Mangal
Chaudhary, R/o village- Jorpura, P.S.- Tajpur, District- Samastipur, At
present W/o Santosh Mishra, R/o village- Bahadurpur, P.S.- Patory, District-
Samastipur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bijay Bhushan Prasad, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kumar Ranjit Ranjan, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 04-02-2022 Due to the third wave of COVID-19 Pandemic, the
matter is being taken up by way of Virtual Court proceeding.

The matter has been listed under the heading 'For Orders'
under the orders of Hon'ble the Chief Justice.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State through virtual mode.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove
the defects, as pointed out by the Office, within a period of four
weeks after restoration of normalcy.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case in which
cognizance has been taken under sections 323 and 498(A) of the



Indian Penal Code.

Allegation against the petitioner is of committing torture upon the victim due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. There is no allegation of tampering of witnesses alleged against the petitioner. The petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case due to petty family dispute. The case is triable by the Magistrate. The petitioner has relied upon the judgment of this Court in the case of ***Md. Naimul Haque Ansari @ Naimul Haque Ansari & Ors. Vs. The State of Bihar, reported in 2006(3) PLJR 182.***

On behalf of the State, it is submitted that the petitioner is named in the Complaint Case/F.I.R.

It is necessary to indicate here that this Court while considering the prayer made in the present anticipatory bail application has taken note of the exponential rise in number of covid cases due to outbreak of third wave of Covid-19 pandemic. Further this Court can also not lose sight of the fact that the condition of jails is not conducive and suitable to the present situation which has arisen due to the sudden rise in covid cases.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petitioner, above named, in the event of arrest/surrender before the learned court below within a period of twelve weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on his personal bonds to the



satisfaction of learned A.C.J.M.- VI, Samastipur in connection with C.R. No. 1759 of 2015, T.R. No. 1537 of 2020, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Once the normalcy is restored, the petitioner shall furnish bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each within a period of eight weeks to the satisfaction of the Court concerned in connection with the aforesaid case.

The petitioner is directed to co-operate during the trial. If the petitioner does not co-operate during the trial, the Court below will be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

If so advised, either of the parties will be at liberty to make an application before the Court below for referring the matter to the District Mediation Centre for the purpose of reconciliation or one time settlement.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

Pankaj/-

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

