

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2801 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-99 Year-2022 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
Rohtas

-
1. RAMAN SINGH @ RAMAN RAM Son of Late Aliyar Singh R/v- Kachhwa, P.S.- Kachhwa, District- Rohtas
 2. ARTI DEVI Wife of Raman Singh R/v- Kachhwa, P.S.- Kachhwa, District- Rohtas
 3. VISHAL KUMAR Son of Raman Singh R/v- Kachhwa, P.S.- Kachhwa, District- Rohtas
 4. CHANDAN KUMAR SINGH @ CHANDAN KUMAR Son of Sri Yugeshwar Singh R/v- Itwa, P.S.- Dawath, District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. RADHESHYAM SINGH Son of Late Ram Naresh Singh At present R/v- Piro District- Bhojpur, Permanent R/v- Kopa, P.O.- Sakla, P.S.- Karakat, District- Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shankar Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Uma Shankar Prasad Singh, APP
Mr.Raghunandan Kumar Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 05-05-2023 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Complaint Case No.99/2022, registered for the offence punishable u/s 147, 420, 406 of IPC and 4 of D.P. Act.

As per the prosecution case, the engagement ceremony of the son of the petitioner no.1 was done with the daughter of the informant and Rs.1,60,000/- was given to the petitioners and when the complainant asked to fix the marriage, they demanded Rs.40,000/- and motorcycle and a gold chain. They, however, refused to solemnize the marriage, if their demand is not fulfilled



and also refused to return the money taken earlier.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. No such occurrence, in the manner as alleged, has ever taken place. The allegation leveled against the petitioners is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. It is submitted that the entire family has been made accused in this case. Petitioners have no criminal antecedent.

Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the O.P. No.2 opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that during the engagement, the complainant and his family members have spent Rs.1,60,000/- and some articles were also given but later on, petitioners refused for the marriage.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the nature of allegation, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on their behalf is hereby rejected.

This application is accordingly dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

pallavi/-

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

