

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86740 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-254 Year-2024 Thana- UDAKISHUNGANJ District-
Madhepura

1. Ranjan Muni Son of Late Radhe Muni
2. Rabri Devi Wife of Ranjan Muni.
Both Resident of Village-Baijnathpur ward No. 07, P.S.- Udakishunganj,
District- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms.Patla Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dinesh Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-04-2025 Heard Ms.Patla Kumari, learned counsel for the
petitioners, learned counsel for the informant and Mr.Dinesh
Singh, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in
connection with Udakishunganj P.S. Case No.254 of 2024, dated
02.08.2024 registered for the offences punishable under
3(5),80(2)of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Allegation against the petitioners is that they
alongwith other co-accused persons have in furtherance of their
common intention committed the dowry death of the daughter
of the informant.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners



submits that the petitioners have clean antecedent. They have falsely been implicated in the present case merely on the ground that the petitioners are inlaws of the deceased. It appears from the FIR that the informant is not the eye witness of the alleged occurrence and it appears from the FIR that there is no specific allegation of any assault, overt-act or demand of dowry attributed against the petitioners and husband of the deceased, who happens to be the son of the petitioners, is already in judicial custody.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State, on the other hand, have vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners. Learned counsel for the informant fairly submits that the husband of the deceased, who happens to be the son of the petitioners, is already in judicial custody.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, petitioners have clean antecedent, there is no specific allegation of any assault, overt-act or demand of dowry attributed against the petitioners, informant is not the eye witness of the alleged occurrence and husband of the deceased, who happens to be the son of the petitioners, is already in judicial custody, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the



court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released 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 Chief Judicial Magistrate-1st, Madhepura in connection with Udakishunganj P.S. Case No.254 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/Section 482(2) of BNSS,2023 and with other following conditions:-

(I) Petitioners shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(II) If the petitioners tamper with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(III) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioners. However, the



acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

