

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26956 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-119 Year-2016 Thana- ROSERA District- Samastipur

1. RAM CHANDRA SAHNI @ RAM CHANDRA SAHANI SON OF LATE TILAK SAHNI RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- RAHUA, PS- ROSERA, DIST- SAMASTIPUR
2. BIHULA DEVI WIFE OF RAM CHANDRA SAHNI @ RAM CHCANDRA SAHANI RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- RAHUA, PS- ROSERA, DIST- SAMASTIPUR

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binod Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 17-07-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 325, 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that earlier the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners were rejected by order dated 25.08.2017 in Cr. Misc. No. 22923 of 2017.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant had alleged that she was married to the son of the petitioners



and after marriage the accused persons were demanding T.V. and Motorcycle and on account of non-fulfillment of the demand, she was tortured and she was later ousted from her matrimonial home, thereafter she had filed a complaint case in which the bail was allowed by this Court with the condition to keep the informant properly but thereafter again torture started when the present FIR came to be instituted as she was brutally assaulted by her husband and the petitioners causing fracture injuries and was treated by Dr. Mahesh Lakhotia later, a panchayati was convened and accused persons assured to obey the decision of the panchayat, as such, no case was filed by the father of the informant considering the future of the informant but on 07.04.2016 in the evening Sujeet Sahani and the petitioners tried to administer Salphas tablet to the informant but she anyhow managed to save herself.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that Sujeet was taken into custody and in a full fledged trial was acquitted by the learned trial court.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners next submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the petitioners are in-laws of the informant



and the allegation against them are general and omnibus in nature, it is also submitted that no useful purpose would be served now by sending the petitioners to jail when Sujeet the main accused has been acquitted.

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

8. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Rosera P.S. Case No. 119 of 2016 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Adnan/-

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

