

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No. 41219 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -600 Year- 2014 Thana -MUZFFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE District-
MUZAFFARPUR

=====

Kundan Kumar Singh @ Kundan Singh, Son of Sri Pashupati Nath Singh,
Resident of Mohalla – Markan Colony, P.S. – Katihar (Town), District –
Katihar.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sakchi, Wife of Kundan Kumar Singh, Daughter of Late Vinod Kumar
Dhawan, Resident of House of Sri Rajesh Kumar Rajak, Shitla Mandir
Gali, Purani Bazar, P.S. – Town, District – Muzaffarpur.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rana Pratap Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kr. 3(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2. 20-03-2015 Heard Sri Rana Pratap Singh, learned counsel for the
petitioner and learned Addl. Public Prosecutor.

The petitioner, who is husband of opposite party no.
2, apprehending his arrest in Complaint Case No. 600 of 2014
registered for offence under Sections 406 & 498(A) of the Indian
Penal Code and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, has
prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, while pressing the
bail petition, submits that prior to filing of the present compliant,
the petitioner himself had filed an application before the Police



Commissioner, Delhi regarding his apprehension for being falsely implicated in a case from his in-laws' side. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance on **Annexure '3'** to the petition. He further submits that ofcourse, in the compliant petition, it has been alleged that the petitioner was demanding a car, fact remains that the petitioner was having his own car, so there was no reason for demanding a car.

Besides hearing, I have also perused the materials available on record, particularly; the impugned order i.e. order dated 06-09-2014. On perusal of the order impugned, it appears that the court below earlier taken steps for settling the dispute in between the parties, but the same failed. The learned Public Prosecutor before the court below had submitted that the petitioner was having some extra-marital relation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in complaint petition, no such allegation was leveled nor on statement on oath, the complainant had made such allegation.

However, in view of facts and circumstances, particularly; the fact that the settlement process has failed, I do not consider that it is a fit case for extending the privilege of

anticipatory bail.

The petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay/-

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