

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26341 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-332 Year-2024 Thana- JEHANABAD COMPLAINT CASE
District- Jehanabad

-
1. Renu Sharma @ Renu Devi W/o- Late Vijay Sharma Village- Nadauna Ps- Bhagwanganj Dist- Jehanabad
 2. Anamika @ Animka Sharma W/o- Late Devarshi Kumar Village- Nayara Ps- Nawada Dist- Nawada
 3. Kumar Shatrunjay S/o- Radhey Sharma Village- Pinjaur Ps- Parasbigha Dist- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Soni Kumari @ Rajni Kumari D/o- Braj Nandan Singh Village- Satsang Nagar, Raja Bazar W.No-4, Ps- Jehanabad Dist- Jehanabad

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pushpa Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 20-08-2025 Heard Mr. Manoj Kumar, learned Counsel for the
petitioners and Mrs. Pushpa Sinha, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 332 of 2024 for the offence registered under sections 498(A), 323, 379 of the IPC and $\frac{3}{4}$ of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per the prosecution story, the complainant alleged that the marriage took place in the year 2021, she was kept in a better manner for only eight months whereafter, the in-laws including the husband started torturing her. Subsequently, as the



event unfolds, allegation is that he fled away with another woman, namely, Sneha Srivastava. This led to the complaint.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submit that two out of three petitioners are ladies. They are mother-in-law and sister-in-laws (nanad) as also the maternal uncle-in-law (mama). They have absolutely no role to play in the matter, the couple was residing at Ranchi while they do not live in Ranchi. Even the allegation of the husband having eloped with another lady is to be accepted, they cannot be blamed for the said change of events. They are ready to co-operate in the investigation and diligently appear in trial.

5. Learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail submitting that they have also played a role in the torture/elopement of the husband.

6. Taking into account the submissions of the parties as also the fact that the two petitioners are ladies while one is maternal uncle-in-law. FIR is there, they shall be facing the music, in that background, this Court is inclined to grant them the anticipatory bail with conditions.

7. Let the petitioner in the event of arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order, shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount



each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jehanabad in connection with Complaint Case No. 332 of 2024 subject to condition as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

(i) one of the bailor should be the family members/relatives of the petitioners, who shall provide official document to show his *bona fide*;

(ii) the petitioners shall appear on each and every date before the Trial court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his bail bond by the Trial court itself;

(iv) the petitioners shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(v) the petitioners shall desist from committing any criminal offence again failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

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

