

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29967 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-997 Year-2022 Thana- BUXAR COMPLAINT CASE District-
Buxar

-
1. Girija Ray Son of Late Saraju Ray Resident of Village - Mango Dihari, P.S.-
Rajpur, District - Buxar.
 2. Ashwani Ray @ Ashwani Kumar Rai Son of Girija Ray Resident of Village
- Mango Dihari, P.S.- Rajpur, District - Buxar.
 3. Virat Ray Son of Girija Ray Resident of Village - Mango Dihari, P.S.-
Rajpur, District - Buxar.
 4. Anita Ray Wife of Ashwani Ray Resident of Village - Mango Dihari, P.S.-
Rajpur, District - Buxar.
 5. Rambha Ray Wife of Virat Ray Resident of Village - Mango Dihari, P.S.-
Rajpur, District - Buxar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Chhaya Kumari Rai Wife of Vivek Rai @ Vinit Rai D/o Srikant Rai,
Resident of Village - Darahpur, P.S.- Buxar (Industrial), District - Buxar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bhaskar Shankar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 24-06-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No.997(c)/2022 dated
07.05.2017 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 498 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the
D.P. Act.



3. According to prosecution case, the complainant, Chhaya Kumari Rai, alleged that after her marriage with Vivek Rai @ Vinit Rai on 07.05.2015, she was subjected to cruelty and harassment by her husband and the accused persons, including the present petitioners, for a dowry of Rs.7 lakh for purchasing a four-wheeler. She further alleged that despite suffering from severe abdominal pain, she was denied medical treatment, and later it was found that she had gallbladder stones, the treatment expenses being borne by her father. Although she returned to her matrimonial home in March 2020, the alleged harassment continued. Finally, on 14.01.2022, the accused persons allegedly assaulted her and drove her out of the matrimonial home, retaining her belongings.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners, by referring to the complaint case, submits that there is general and omnibus allegation of demand of dowry against these petitioners. It is the case of the petitioner that they never demanded any dowry or ever tortured the complainant and this fact is substantiated by the statement recorded by the complainant by solemn affirmation made in the course of enquiry in the said complaint case.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for



anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances that there is no specific case against these petitioners rather the allegations are general and omnibus in nature and the complainant wants to stay with the in-laws, which issues can well be addressed in the duly substituted proceeding and can better be appreciated by the anticipatory bail application filed by the husband of the complainant. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. 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) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned S.D.J.M., Buxar, in connection with Complaint Case No.997(c) / 2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita and with other following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative/known of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document/personal affidavit to show his/her bona fide;



(ii) the petitioner(s) 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/her/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) 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;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

sharun/-

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

