

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68732 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-286 Year-2023 Thana- BHABHU(KAIMUR) COMPLAIN C
District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

-
1. TUNTUN PANDEY SON OF BACHCHA PANDEY RESIDENT OF PLOT NO.50, POLICE STATION- SECTOR NO.63, CHETPUR COLONY, NEAR CHET RAM HOSPITAL, KHESRA NO.187, YADRAM MARG, NOIDA, UTTAR PRADESH (U.P.)
 2. USHA DEVI WIFE OF TUNTUN PANDEY RESIDENT OF PLOT NO.50, SECTOR NO.63, CHETPUR COLONY, NEAR CHET RAM HOSPITAL, KHESRA NO.187, YADRAM MARG, NOIDA, UTTAR PRADESH (U.P.)
 3. PALAVI @ PALAVI PANDEY WIFE OF NITIN PANDEY, D/O. TUNTUN PANDEY RESIDENT OF D-75, SUDAMANAGAR, POLICE STATION - ANPURNA, DISTRICT - INDORE, MADHYA PRADESH (M.P.)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR
2. SHALINI PANDEY WIFE OF PANKAJ PANDEY, D/O. KASHI NATH PANDEY PRESENTLY RESIDING AT D/O. KASHINATH PANDEY, RESIDENT OF BHABHUA WARD NO.19, POST OFFICE AND POLICE STATION - BHABHUA, DISTRICT - KAIMUR (BHABHUA), BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Amir Alam, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Bharat Lal, APP.
	Mr. Pawan Kumar Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 25-01-2024 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Allegedly, all the accused persons including the petitioners are said to have assaulted the complainant and ousted



her from the matrimonial home in association of other family members over the dowry demand.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged ever took place. Petitioners are father-in-law, mother-in-law and married *Nanad*, respectively of the complainant. They have been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioners is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. The real fact is that the complainant herself left her matrimonial house along with her all belongings and went to her *Maike*. Petitioners have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, as there is no specific overt act against the petitioners, let the above named petitioners, be released on bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned lower Court where the case is pending/successor Court in



connection with Complaint Case No. 286 of 2023, subject to the
condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

