

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71981 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2021 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Bhojpur

PREM NARAYAN SINGH Son of Late Ramayan Singh R/v- Near Vir Kuwar
Singh Hatta, Side of Office, P.S.- Jagdishpur, District- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vikramdeo Singh, Advocate Mr.Rajesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr.Shashank Shekhar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Md. Shakir Ahmad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 15-05-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and Mr. Md. Shakir Ahmad, learned
APP for the State.

The petitioner, in the present case, is seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No. 19 of 2021 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406/420/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code. He has one criminal antecedent as stated in paragraph '3' of the application in which he is on bail.

As per the prosecution story, it is alleged that the informant's elder sister was married to the elder son of the petitioner, hence, the informant used to regularly visit the house of the petitioner. The relationship developed between the informant and the younger son of the petitioner namely, Mani @



Raushan Kumar Singh. The said accused took photograph of the informant on the promise of marriage and for this promise, the informant's parents gave Rs. 5,00,000/- to the petitioner but later on petitioner demanded Rs. 15,00,000/- and a four wheeler, but on showing inability to fulfill their demand, the petitioner threatened the informant's parents to defame her daughter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Learned counsel submits that allegation of demand of Rs. 15,00,000/- is totally false. Learned counsel further submits that both the parties are closely to each other.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

Having regard to the kind of allegations against the petitioner and the fact that both of them are closely related to each other, this court directs that in case of his arrest/surrender within a period of four weeks from today, let the petitioner above-named be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (twenty five thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned S.D.J.M., Bhojpur (G.R. No. 872 of 2021) in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No. 19 of 2021, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section



438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

And further condition that the petitioner shall not in any way try to contact the informant, his younger daughter who is said to have been married and her matrimonial home. In case any such complaint is found, the informant may approach this Court.

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.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Rajeev/-

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

