

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1681 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-68 Year-2021 Thana- MARANCHI District- Patna

SARITA DEVI W/o Vinod Yadav Resident of Village- Maranchi, P.S.-  
Maranchi, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Pandey, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar No. 1, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      04-08-2022                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 365 366 and 120(b) of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman and the informant alleges and on 15.01.2021 when his wife was going to her parrental home along with his child aged about one and half years when she met Vinod Yadav who along with the accused persons, including the petitioner, intiesed her and took her to Bangalore by truck, where they stayed for four months, it is next alleged that Vinod Yadav and Subhas Yadav used to drive car there, it is next alleged that whenever his wife used to ask



the accused person to send her back home he used to tell her to give her son and thereafter to leave Bangalore.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from bare perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the same is vague, cryptic and at the same time bizarre. It is next submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that wife of the informant was a major she had a child and she went to Bangalore and stayed there for four months even without informing the informant that in itself demonstrates that she on her volition had gone to Bangalore, it is next submitted that petitioner is wife of Vinod Yadav, it is further submitted that the statement of the victim was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. where she has not alleged that any kind of physical or sexual assault was committed on her, nor she alleges that they took her forcefully.

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

Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on



anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Maranchi P.S. Case No. 68 of 2021 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

Shivam/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

