

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49887 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-353 Year-2022 Thana- JEHANABAD COMPLAINT CASE
District- Jehanabad

-
1. Munchun Kumar Son Of Bakhori Ram R/O- Village- Chadh, P.S.- Tehta, Distt.- Jehanabad
 2. Santan Kumar Son Of Bakhori Ram R/O- Village- Chadh, P.S.- Tehta, Distt.- Jehanabad
 3. Bakhori Ram Son Of Late Badhu Ram R/O- Village- Chadh, P.S.- Tehta, Distt.- Jehanabad
 4. Dhanomati Devi Wife Of Bakhori Ram R/O- Village- Chadh, P.S.- Tehta, Distt.- Jehanabad
 5. Sweety Kumari Wife Of Santan Kumar R/O- Village- Chadh, P.S.- Tehta, Distt.- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Sunita Devi Wife Of Pappu Kumar R/O- Village- Chadh, P.S.- Makhdampur, Distt.- Jehanabad

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sunil Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Akbar Ali

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 26-10-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for opp. party no. 2.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a complaint case punishable for the offence under Sections 498A, 323 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that complainant was married with Pappu Kumar in the year 2009 and after the marriage, when she went to her matrimonial house, her in-laws family members ill treated, harassed and tortured her for dowry. It is further alleged that husband of complainant used to live



outside for his livelihood and therefore, all the in-laws family members assaulted the complainant and snatched her belongings.

4. Petitioner no. 1 & 2 are brother-in-law (*Devar*), petitioner no. 3 is father-in-law, petitioner no. 4 is mother-in-law and petitioner no. 5 is sister-in-law (*Gotini*) of the complainant and they have been falsely implicated in this case. As a matter of fact, petitioner no. 4 had purchased a piece of land, on which, a house was constructed and her family members were living in the said house. The complainant and her husband demanded their share in the said land, which was refused by petitioner no. 4 and as such, this false and concocted case has been lodged by complainant against her in-laws family members. Petitioners are separate in mess and property and have got no concern with the affairs of couple. Rest of the allegation is only ornamental in order to make the case grave. Petitioners claim clean antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioners.

6. Considering the backdrop of the case, relationship between the parties and clean antecedent, the prayer for anticipatory bail is allowed.



7. Accordingly, let the above named petitioners, in the event of their arrest/surrender within a period of eight weeks from today, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Jehanabad in connection with Complaint Case No. 353 of 2022, subject to condition as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

anay

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

