

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30102 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-82 Year-2022 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Samastipur

Champa Devi @ Urmila Devi Wife Of Nanki Paswan Resident Of Vill-
Dihuli Ward No 14, Ps-Angarghat Distt- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Deepak Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Jha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 26-07-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 363,
366(A), 354(B), 341, 323, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal
Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a woman having clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that the accused persons, including the petitioner,
confined her in their house on 29.10.2022 and petitioner said to
marry her son, Bipin, further on 31.10.2022, she fled from the
house and disclosed the occurrence to her parents and the
villagers and thereafter the case was instituted.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR it would manifest that the date of occurrence is 29.10.2022 and the FIR was instituted on 01.11.2022 i.e. after a delay of three days. It is further submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that if what has been alleged in the FIR is true, that the informant was kidnapped by the petitioner and her family members, then why no FIR came to be instituted by the family members of the informant but the fact that after the victim returned after fleeing from the place of occurrence, as alleged, thereafter the FIR was instituted that casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution as to whether any occurrence in the manner, as alleged, had even taken place or not.

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

6. 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. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) 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 Mahila P.S.
Case No. 82 of 2022 subject to the conditions as laid down
under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishi/-

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

