

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4599 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-762 Year-2022 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Araria

Ranjeet Kumar Yadav Son Of Gayanand Yadav Resident Of Village -
Kanchanpur Tola, Ward No. 11, Karor Dighali, P.S. - Palasi , District - Araria

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Anjali Kumari D/O Manoj Kr. Yadav R/O Village- Kanchanpur Tola Wrd
No.-11, Panchayat Karor Dighali, P.S- Palasi, Distt.- Araria.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhav Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nand Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 11-07-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 493, 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. From perusal of the office report dated 28.06.2024, it manifests that the notice has been received by the O.P. No.2 personally. The O.P. No.2 despite receiving notice personally chooses not to appear.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the complainant with an allegation that he exploited her physically



on pretext of marriage and later refused. It is next submitted that the complainant deliberately instituted the instant complaint case and not an F.I.R. as she was aware that in the event if an F.I.R. is instituted the same would be investigated by the police and the truth would come to light. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the complaint, it would manifest that the same also does not inspire confidence, for the reason that it lacks in material detail and the allegations are more general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that the complainant is a differently-able person and the complaint does not disclose as to how the petitioner and complainant came to know each other. It is also submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will co-operate in the trial.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

5. 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.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case



is pending/successor court in connection with Complaint Case No.762/2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

6. However, in the event, if the learned trial court comes to a conclusion that petitioner after obtaining anticipatory bail is trying to delay the trial in any manner, the learned trial court shall be at liberty to forthwith cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner and to ensure that all coercive steps are taken to put petitioner behind bars.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

