

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80081 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1108 Year-2010 Thana- SASARAM NAGAR District- Rohtas

1. SUMAN DEVI Wife Of Nandlal Sao Resident Of C-5/42 N, Teliyana Chetganj, Varanasi, District - Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh - 221001
2. POONAM DEVI Wife Of Prabhat Sao Resident Of Mohalla - Kabirchavra, P.S. - Chetganj, District - Varanasi
3. PINKI DEVI Wife Of Manoj Sav Resident Of Mohalla - Lahuravir, P.S. - Chetganj, District - Varanasi
4. MUNNI DEVI Daughter Of Sudama Prasad Resident Of Mohalla - Bhartiganj, P.S. - Sasaram (T), District - Rohtas
5. GUDIA KUMARI Daughter Of Sudama Prasad Resident Of Mohalla - Bhartiganj, P.S. - Sasaram (T), District - Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioners : Mr. Priyajeet Pandey, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Tarkeshwar Nath Thakur, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 10-01-2024 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 342, 323, 498A, 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, it is alleged that all the FIR named accused persons, including these petitioners, assaulted the victim/informant due to non-fulfillment of demand for dowry and ousted her.



4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners are sisters and cousins of the informant's husband. Specific accusation is against husband of informant and there is general and omnibus allegation against these petitioners. Petitioners are separate in mess & property and have got no concern with the affairs of the informant and her husband. Moreover, husband of the informant has already been acquitted vide judgment dated 18.02.2019, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge IX, Rohtas at Sasaram. It is further submitted that from bare perusal of the impugned order, it is apparent that earlier anticipatory bail of the petitioners was allowed on 17.08.2011 in ABP No. 860 of 2011 by the court of learned District and Sessions Judge, Rohtas, but the petitioners did not surrender in time. Petitioners claim clean antecedents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and nature of accusations, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners is allowed.

7. Accordingly, in the event of arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks from today, let the above named



petitioners be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Sessions Judge IX, Rohtas at Sasaram, in connection with Sasaram (T) P.S. Case No. 1108 of 2010, subject to condition as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

