

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11934 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1114 Year-2019 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE
District- Rohtas

=====

INDU DEVI WIFE OF RAMPRAVESH SINGH @ ACCHYALAL SINGH
R/O-KHADAWN ALIAS KHAWAD, P.S.-DINARA, DISTT.-ROHTAS AT
SASARAM

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shivji Sah S/o Late Nayak Sah R/o vill and P.O. and P.s. - Kochas, Distt. -
Rohtas at Sasaram

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Jai Prakash Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Umeshanand Pandit, APP
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Rang Nath Pandey, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 09-07-2024 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 420 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the complaint case, in the year 2015, this petitioner, along with other accused persons, requested the complainant to give a sum of 6 lakh rupees as loan and also made paper for the same on 30.04.2015 and after four days, they



executed the paper and received the sum of 6 lakh rupees. It is further alleged that co-accused Rampravesh Singh further demanded 12 lakh rupees from the complainant and on his request, 12 lakh rupees was paid by the complainant and again a paper for sale was executed. Thereafter, co-accused Rampravesh Singh returned 27 thousand rupees on 30.12.2017 and executed a paper for the same. Thereafter, when the complainant demanded rest of the money, it is alleged that accused persons gave a cheque of 6 lakh rupees of Punjab National Bank Usrav Branch and a cheque of 11 lakh 73 thousand rupees of Bank of India, Kochas. However, both the cheque got bounced due to insufficiency of funds. When the complainant demanded his money, this petitioner, along with unknown persons, on 24.11.2019, came to the shop of the complainant and abused and threatened him.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is a lady and she never signed any paper or made any money transaction with the complainant. As per the complaint case, it was co-accused Rampravesh Singh, who happens to be husband of this petitioner, who promised to sell the land in question to the complainant. However, at this stage, without admitting her guilt



and while denying the complaint case, the petitioner is ready to deposit the disputed sum of Rs. 6,00,000/- (Six Lakh Rupees) in easy installments.

5. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is allowed.

6. Accordingly, in the event of arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks from today, let the above named petitioner be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned A.C.J.M.-cum-Sub Judge VII, Rohtas, Sasaram, in connection with Complaint Case No. 1114 of 2019, subject to condition as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, along with the following terms and conditions:

- A. At the time of furnishing bail-bond **Rs. 2,00,000/-** (Rupees two lacs) shall be deposited through cash in the *Nazarat* of the Civil Court, Sasaram.
- B. Rest amount i.e. **Rs. 4,00,000/-** (Rupees four lac) shall be deposited in the *Nazarat* of Civil Court, Sasaram, in four equal installments within a period of one year from the date of furnishing bail-bond.
- C. The aforesaid payment shall be subject to the final outcome of the case.
- D. If petitioner fails to comply the aforesaid direction of this Court, the Court below is free to cancel the bail-bond of the petitioner.



7. It is made clear that without going into the merit of the case, the aforesaid order has been passed only for the purpose of grant of bail.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

