

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22959 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-880 Year-2020 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Ram Vinay Singh @ Ram Binay Singh Son Of Late Ram Bhawan Singh
Resident Of Village Khajuri, Police Station Naubatpur, District Patna
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Vina Devi Wife Of Ram Vinay Singh Resident Of Village- Khajuri, Police
Station -NAUBATPUR, District Patna At Present Resident Of Vilalge-
Shahar Rampur Alipur Tola, Ps Naubatpur ,DISTRICT Patna
... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Shanker Pankaj, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 10-10-2023 Despite of inter appearance through *Vakalatnama*, no
one appears on behalf of the Opposite Party No. 2.

2. Heard Mr. Ravi Shanker Pankaj, learned counsel
for the petitioner and Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No. 880 C of 2020, dated
24.11.2020 for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 341,
498A and 504 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. According to prosecution case, this petitioner along
with other accused persons used to torture the complainant due
to non-fulfillment of demand of motorcycle.

5. 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 the allegation as alleged in the complaint petition is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offences as alleged in the complaint petition. He further submits that the marriage of the petitioner with the complainant was performed in the year 1981 and before the filing of the present complaint petition there was no complain against the petitioner and due to some land and property dispute, the complainant has filed the present false and fabricated complaint petition against the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner is ready to keep her with full honour and dignity.

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

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on 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 Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate VI, Danapur, District-Patna in connection with Complaint Case No. 880 C of 2020,



subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and with other following conditions:-

i. 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.

ii. 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.

iii. 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)

Vanisha/-

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

