

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68550 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-72 Year-2004 Thana- GOVINDGANJ District- East Champaran

1. Yunus Mian @ Yunus Ansari S/O Akhtar Mian, R/O Vill.- Khajuriya, P.S.- Malahi, District- East Champaran.
2. Sultana Khatoon W/O Yunus Mian @ Yunus Ansari, R/O Vill.- Khajuriya, P.S.- Malahi, District- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mehroon Khatoon W/O Usman Ansari R/O Vill.- Khajuriya, P.S.- Malahi, Dist.- East Champaran.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manjeet Kumar Mishra, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

6 19-11-2025 Heard learned Advocate for the petitioners and
learned Advocate for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Govindganj Malahi P.S. Case No.72 of 2004 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498A, 341, 342, 327 and 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The marriage of opposite party no.2 was solemnized with co-accused Usman Khatoon in the year 1996. However, on account of non-fulfillment of dowry, she was tortured in various ways. The accused persons, including the



petitioners, brutally assaulted the informant.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioners submitted the petitioners were residing in Chhattisgarh and as such, they had no knowledge about the institution of the present case. Moreover, the petitioners are none else but the brother-in-law and his wife. The police, after investigation, submitted a charge-sheet only under Sections 498A and 494/34 of the Indian Penal Code. However, the learned court below, despite taking note of the aforesaid fact, has not considered the prayer for bail of the petitioners on account of the fact that process under Section 82 has already been issued.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State has opposed the bail application.

6. Having considered the materials available on record, especially the fact that the case was instituted in the year 2004 and the petitioners are named in the FIR, besides the fact that process under Section 82 of the CrPC has already been issued, this Court is not acceded to the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners. Accordingly, their prayer is rejected.

7. However, if the petitioners surrender before the jurisdictional court within a period of four weeks from today and seek regular bail, the same shall be considered and disposed



off on its own merit(s) without being prejudiced by this order.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

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

