

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74686 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1629 Year-2022 Thana- EAST CHAMPARAN COMPLAINT
District- East Champaran

-
1. RAVISH PANDEY @ RAVISH KUMAR PANDEY Son of Late Shahi Pandey R/V- Hussaini, Kashba Tola Ward no. 8, P.S- Dumariyaghat Distt- East Champaran
 2. Meena Devi @ Mina Devi D/o Late Shahi Pandey R/V- Hussaini, Kashba Tola Ward no. 8, P.S- Dumariyaghat Distt- East Champaran
 3. Reena Devi @ Rina Devi @ Rina Kumari Devi @ Rina Kumari Wife of Ravish Pandey @ Ravish Kumar Pandey R/V- Hussaini, Kashba Tola Ward no. 8, P.S- Dumariyaghat Distt- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rajani Kumari D/o Surendra Sahani R/V- Hussaini, Kashba Tola Ward no. 9, P.S- Dumariyaghat, Dist- East Champaran

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Madhurendra Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nirmala Kumari, APP.
Mr. Vijay Shankar Shrivastava, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 28-03-2023 Heard the parties.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 354(B), 372, 373, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly, petitioners are said to have sold the complainant to the Orchestra.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. Petitioner nos. 1 & 3 are maternal uncle and aunt of the complainant whereas petitioner no.2 is mother of the



complainant. No such occurrence as alleged ever took place. Petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case due to matrimonial dispute between the petitioner no.2 and her husband. There is case and counter case between the parties. Petitioner no.2 has also filed complaint case against her husband. To save his skin, he enticed his daughter to lodge this case against the petitioners. The allegation levelled against the petitioners is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. Petitioner nos. 1 & 3 have one criminal antecedent whereas petitioner no.2 has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

Per contra, learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that the allegations levelled against the petitioners is serious in nature, hence they do not deserve anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of case as well as the essay of the complainant, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

