

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42666 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-172 Year-2021 Thana- JEHANABAD COMPLAINT CASE  
District- Jehanabad

- 
1. AKHILESH RAVIDAS S/O NANDESHWAR RAVIDAS R/O Village-Netar, P.S- Daniyawan, Distt.- Patna.
  2. Mahesh Das @ Mahesh Ravidas S/O Nandeshwar Ravidas R/O Village-Netar, P.S- Daniyawan, Distt.- Patna.
  3. Nandeshwar Ravidas S/O Late Yaddu Das R/O Village- Netar, P.S- Daniyawan, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mahendra Ravidas son of Kalicharan Ravidas Resident of village- Katauli p.s.- Hulasganj, District- Jehanabad

... .. Opposite Party/s

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shivendra Prasad  
For the Opposite Party/s : Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

5      13-02-2024              1.    Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

                                         2.    The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 406 of the Indian Penal Code.

                                         3.    The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the marriage of the daughter of the OP No. 2 was fixed with petitioner No. 1, who is son of petitioner No. 3. It is next submitted that at the time when the marriage was fixed, gift worth Rs. 95,000/- was given to the side of the groom. It is



further submitted that the father of the petitioner No. 1 was interested in getting his son married to the daughter of the OP No. 2, but then petitioner No. 1 was not inclined for the marriage, as such he performed his marriage with a girl of his choice. Hence, the marriage in between the daughter of the OP No. 2 and the petitioner No. 1 could not materialize. It is further submitted that the instant FIR has been instituted only for the purpose of recovery of money, when the petitioner has returned Rs.20,000/- which the OP No. 2 had given at the time when the marriage was fixed. It is thus submitted that OP No. 2 is alleging that Rs.95,000/- was given while the case of the petitioner is that only an amount of Rs.20,000/- was given which was returned.

4. The learned APP along with the learned counsel for the OP No. 2 opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners, but then the OP No. 2 is not in a position to bring to the notice of the court that by what mode the aforesaid gift or payment was made to the side of the petitioners.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their 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. 10,000/-  
(Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like  
amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial  
Magistrate, 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Jehanabad, in connection with Complaint  
Case No. 172 of 2021, Tr. No. 1232 of 2022 subject to the  
conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

