

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No. 728 of 2024

Ravi Ranjan Kumar Appellant
Versus
1.The State of Jharkhand
2.Archana Hembrom Respondents
With
Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No. 687 of 2024

1.Raj Kumar Yadav
2.Kunti Kumari @ Kunti Devi
3.Abhyas Kumar @ Sonu @ Abhyas Sonu
..... Appellants
Versus
1.The State of Jharkhand
2.Archana Hembrom Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRASAD

For the Appellants : Mr. Jalaj Pati Tiwari, Advocate
[In both the cases]
For the State : Mr. Rakesh Kr. Sinha, A.P.P.
[In Cr.Appeal (S.J.) No. 728 of 2024]
: Mrs. Bandana Sinha, A.P.P.
[In Cr.Appeal (S.J.) No. 687 of 2024]

ORAL ORDER IN COURT

09/17.09.2025 Both the cases have been heard together
as the appellants in both the cases are members of the
same family and both appeals arise out of the same F.I.R.

2. The Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No. 728 of
2024 has been filed on behalf of the appellant challenging
the order dated 12.09.2024, passed in A.B.P. No. 1516 of
2024, by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI,
Hazaribagh, by which prayer for anticipatory bail made on
behalf of the appellant, namely Ravi Ranjan Kumar has
been rejected.

The Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No. 687 of
2024 has been filed on behalf of the appellants

challenging the order dated 10.09.2024, passed in A.B.P. No. 1616 of 2024, by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI, Hazaribagh, by which prayer for anticipatory bail made on behalf of the appellants, namely Raj Kumar Yadav, Kunti Kumari @ Kunti Devi, Abhyas Kumar @ Sonu @ Abhyas Sonu has been rejected.

The appellants are apprehending arrest in connection with Chauparan P.S. Case No. 249 of 2024 instituted on 13.07.2024 under Sections 126 (2), 127(2), 115(2), 85, 89, 109, 352, 351(2), 61(2), 303(2) and 324(4) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 3(2)(iii) of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, pending in the Court of A.D.J.-VI-cum-Special Judge SC/ST Act, Hazaribagh.

3. As per F.I.R., the appellant of Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No. 728 of 2024, namely Ravi Ranjan Kumar, has performed Court marriage with the Informant, however, after marriage she was subjected to assault several times and it is alleged that the appellant Ravi Ranjan Kumar and his family members abused her in the name of her caste. Several other aggressions are also alleged to have been made against the Informant-Respondent No.2.

4. Heard learned counsel for the appellants, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the Respondent No.2.

5. It is submitted that the case has been compromised between the parties.

It is submitted that the appellant Ravi Ranjan Kumar, i.e. the appellant of Cr.Appeal (S.J.) No. 728 of 2024 is the husband of the Respondent No.2,

whereas Appellant No.1, Appellant No.2 and Appellant No.3 of Criminal Appeal No. 687 of 2024, namely Raj Kumar Yadav, Kunti Kumari @ Kunti Devi and Abhyas Kumar @ Sonu @ Abhyas Sonu respectively are father-in-law, mother-in-law and Brother-in-law, i.e. Devar of the Informant.

It is submitted that the joint compromise petition has been filed by both the sides on 25.04.2025 and later on supplementary affidavit has been filed on 12.09.2025 on behalf of the appellant in Cr. Appeal (S.J.) No. 728 of 2024 admitting the factum of compromise between the parties.

It is also submitted that the appellant-husband and the Respondent No.2 have filed a suit before the learned Court below for grant of Divorce with mutual consent, being Original Suit No. 128 of 2025 and the Informant is also willing to withdraw the Original Maintenance Case No. 242 of 2024 and hence the Appellants may be enlarged on Anticipatory Bail.

6. On the other hand, the learned A.P.P. has raised no objection.

7. Learned counsel for the Respondent No.2 has also admitted the factum of compromise and submitted that the case has been compromised between the parties on certain terms and conditions and he has no objection if any order is passed in favour of the appellants.

8. Perused the supplementary affidavit dated 12.09.2025 and the agreement-cum-joint compromise

petition dated 25.04.2025 enclosed with the said supplementary affidavit.

The Para 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the supplementary Affidavit read as follows:-

“Para 3:- *That it is stated and submitted that outside the court with the help of well wisher has been settled in between the informant and accused persons and now the informant not willing to continue the case.*

Para 4:- *That it is stated and submitted that vide order dated 29.08.2025 it was directed by Hon’ble Court to file supplementary affidavit about joint compromise the same is being filed here through this affidavit.*

Photocopy of the Agreement made between informant and accused persons is being annexed herewith and marked as Annexure-1 to this petition.

Para 5:-*That it is stated and submitted that petitioner and informant both are agree to file divorce by mutual consent in the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Hazaribagh and original suit no. 128 of 2025.*

Certified copy of Original Suit no. 128/2025 is Annexed here with and marked as Annexure-2 to this petition.

Para 6:- *That it is stated and submitted that informant also willing to withdraw a maintenance case that is case no. Original Maintenance Case no. 242 of 2024.”*

The copy of the agreement-cum-compromise dated 25.04.2025 between the appellant Ravi Ranjan Kumar and the Respondent No. 2 has also been enclosed as Annexure-1 with the supplementary affidavit dated 12.09.2025.

9. However, it appears that Paragraph 3 to 6 of the supplementary affidavit dated 12.09.2025 contains several grammatical errors at various places, but the same are not being corrected by this Court as the same are part of the supplementary affidavit date 12.09.2025 filed by the petitioner-appellant. The supplementary affidavit also contains photocopy of the Agreement-cum-Settlement dated 25.04.2025 in Four (04) sheets duly signed by the appellant-Ravi Ranjan Kumar and Respondent No. 2-Archana Hemrom on 25.04.2025. It also contains the ordersheet dated 16.06.2025 of Original Suit No. 128 of 2025 filed by the Respondent No.2-Archana Hemrom, which reveals that the case has been filed by Archana Hemrom against the appellant Ravi Ranjan Kumar and which has been admitted and fixed on 25.11.2025 for reconciliation between the parties for grant of divorce by mutual consent. The supplementary affidavit also contains the plaint of Original Suit No. 128 of 2025 in Seven (07) sheets, photocopy of order dated 22.02.2025 passed in Original Maintenance Case No. 242 of 2024 filed by the Respondent No.2-Archana Hemrom against the appellant-Ravi Ranjan Kumar, which reveals that the Original Case No. 242 of 2024 has been withdrawn on 22.05.2025 by the Respondent No.2 filed before the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Hazaribagh.

10. It transpires that the Appellant Ravi Ranjan Kumar and the Respondent No. 2, namely Archana Hemrom have also put their signatures on the said agreement dated 25.04.2025.

11. It reveals from Annexure 3 to this supplementary affidavit dated 12.09.2025 that on 22.05.2025, the Respondent No.2 has withdrawn Original Maintenance Case No.242 of 2024 from the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Hazaribagh on 22.05.2025.

12. Para 3 and 4 of the Agreement-cum-Settlement contains the following statement:-

“Para 3:- That both the sides, in presence of their elders are ready to settle the dispute outside the Court in presence of their elders.

Para 4:- That the first party, i.e. Archana Hemrom, who has instituted two cases against the second party, i.e. the appellant Ravi Ranjan Kumar, will withdraw both the cases. The second party, who had also instituted case against the first party and her family members, will also withdraw those cases.”

13. It also appears that the case has been settled between the appellants and Respondent No.2.

14. Accordingly, the order dated 12.09.2024, passed in A.B.P. No. 1516 of 2024 and the order dated 19.09.2024, passed in A.B.P. No. 1616 of 2024 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI, Hazaribagh are set aside.

15. Under the circumstances, the prayer for anticipatory bail is allowed and the appellant of Cr.Appeal (S.J.) No. 728 of 2024, namely Ravi Ranjan Kumar and appellants of Cr.Appeal (S.J.) No. 687 of 2024, namely Raj Kumar Yadav, Kunti Kumari @ Kunti Devi, Abhyas Kumar @ Sonu @ Abhyas Sonu are directed to surrender before

the learned Court below within Six (06) weeks from today and in the event of their arrest or surrender, the appellants shall be released on bail, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each in connection with Chauparan P.S. Case No. 249 of 2024 to the satisfaction of A.D.J.-VI-cum-Special Judge SC/ST Act, Hazaribagh/or his Successor Court..

16. Thus, this Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No. 728 of 2024 and Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No. 687 of 2024 are allowed.

(Sanjay Prasad, J.)

s.m.