

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30060 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1481 Year-2022 Thana- GAYA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Gaya

=====

Ram Bali Prasad @ Ram Bali Mahto son of Late Ram Karan Mahto R/o
Village - Bishambharpur PS - Kosma Dist – Aurangabad (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Veena Devi wife of Sakaldev Singh R/o Village - Belaganj Hanuman Nagar
PS - Belaganj Dist - Gaya

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sujit Kumar, Advocate Ms. Shruti Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 09-05-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.
Chandra Bhushan Prasad learned A.P.P. for the State.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offence punishable under Section 406 of the
Indian Penal Code.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and has been falsely
implicated in the instant case by the complainant. It is further
submitted that in sum and substance, the allegation is that the
marriage of the daughter of the complainant was fixed with the
son of the petitioner and the complainant's side had gifted
Rs.6,50,000/- towards wedding expense out of which
Rs.3,50,000/- was given in the account of the son of the



petitioner but for some reason, the marriage could not be solemnized as such the petitioner returned only an amount of Rs.4,70,000/-, hence, the instant case was instituted with an allegation that Rs.1,80,000/- till date has not been returned along with gifted ornaments.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the complainant's side had gifted Rs.3,50,000/- in the account of the son of the petitioner and thereafter had also gifted Rs.1,20,000/- in cash as such the petitioner returned an amount of Rs.4,70,000/- in the account of the husband of the complainant. It is further submitted that even the complainant in the complaint alleges that only Rs.3,50,000/- was paid in the account of the son of the petitioner but since Rs.1,20,000/- was also gifted, hence, the petitioner returned the said amount also in the account of the husband of the complainant. It is next submitted that the instant case has been instituted only with a view to coerce the petitioner into submission for recovering the alleged monetary dues which the petitioner does not owe.

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 his 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.5,000/- (Rupees Five 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 Gaya Complaint Case No. 1481 of 2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

