

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36225 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-356 Year-2022 Thana- RAJNAGAR District- Madhubani

1. SUDAMA DEVI W/O GUNDESHWAR YADAV R/O Village- Pilakhwar, P.S- Rajnagar, Distt.- Madhubani.
2. Raso Devi W/O Kameshwar Yadav R/O Village- Pilakhwar, P.S- Rajnagar, Distt.- Madhubani.
3. Vissammar Devi @ Virma Devi W/O Vindeshwar Yadav R/O Village- Pilakhwar, P.S- Rajnagar, Distt.- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ravi Prakash, Advocate Mr. Gagandeep Yadav, Advocate Mr. Udeshya Kr. Yadav, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIPUL M. PANCHOLI
ORAL ORDER

2 27-07-2023 This application is filed under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for enlarging the applicants on anticipatory bail in connection with Rajnagar P.S. Case No. 356 of 2022, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 324, 307, 353, 332, 333 and 504 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Heard Mr. Ravi Prakash, learned advocate for the applicants and Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman, learned APP for respondent-State.

3. Learned advocate for the applicants submits that the nature of allegations are such for which custodial



interrogation at this stage is not necessary. He further submits that the applicants will keep themselves available during the course of investigation, trial also and will not flee from justice.

4. Learned advocate for the applicants on instructions states that the applicants are ready and willing to abide by all the conditions including imposition of conditions with regard to powers of Investigating Agency to file an application before the competent Court for his remand. He further submits that upon filing of such application by the Investigating Agency, the right of applicants accused to oppose such application on merits may be kept open. Learned advocate, therefore, submitted that considering the above facts, the applicants may be granted anticipatory bail.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent-State has opposed grant of anticipatory bail looking to the nature and gravity of the offence.

6. Having heard the learned advocates for the parties and perusing the material placed on record and taking into consideration the facts of the case, nature of allegations, gravity of offences, role attributed to the accused, without discussing the evidence in detail, at this stage, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicants.



7. This Court has considered following aspects:

- (i) Applicants are lady.
- (ii) General allegations are leveled against the applicants in the FIR in question.
- (iii) Custodial interrogation of the applicants is not required in the facts of the present case.

8. This Court has also taken into consideration the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors.**, reported at **(2011) 1 SCC 694**, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court reiterated the law laid down by the Constitution Bench in the case of **Shri Gurubaksh Singh Sibbia & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab**, reported at **(1980) 2 SCC 565**.

9. Accordingly, the applicants, named above, are ordered to be released on bail in the event of their arrest in connection with Rajnagar P.S. Case No. 356 of 2022, on his executing a personal bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Only) with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of learned Additional Sessions Judge-IX, Madhubani, on the following conditions:

- (a) shall cooperate with the investigation and make themselves available for interrogation, whenever required;



(b) shall remain present at concerned Police Station on 16th August, 2023 between 11:00 a.m. and 02:00 p.m.;

(c) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer;

(d) shall not obstruct or hamper the police investigation and not play mischief with the evidence collected or yet to be collected by the police;

(e) shall not leave India without the permission of the concerned trial court and, if having passport, shall deposit the same before the concerned trial court within a week;

(f) it would be open to the Investigating Officer to file an application for remand if he considers it proper and just and the competent Court would decide it on merits;

10. Despite this order, it would be open for the Investigating Agency to apply to the competent Court, for police remand of the applicants. The applicants shall remain present before the competent Court on the first date of hearing of such application and on all subsequent occasions, as may be directed by the competent Court. This would be sufficient to treat the accused in the judicial custody for the purpose of entertaining



application of the prosecution for police remand. This is, however, without prejudice to the right of the accused to seek stay against an order of remand, if, ultimately, granted, and the power of the competent Court to consider such a request in accordance with law. It is clarified that the applicants, even if, remanded to the police custody, upon completion of such period of police remand, shall be set free immediately, subject to other conditions of this anticipatory bail order.

11. At the trial, the concerned trial court shall not be influenced by the *prima facie* observations made by this Court in the present order.

12. This application is, accordingly, allowed.

(Vipul M. Pancholi, J)

Adnan/-

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

