

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.12474 of 2015**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -128 Year- 2014 Thana -ATHMALGOLA District- PATNA

=====

Umesh Kumar Prabhakar Son of Sri Baleshwar Prasad, Resident of  
Mohalla - Professors Colony, Naya Tola Madhopur, P.S. - Bakhtiyarpur,  
District - Patna.

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... .... Opposite Party

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mritunjay Prasad Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Renuka Ratnakar (App)

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR**  
**JHA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      30-11-2015      Heard Sri N.K. Agrawal, learned counsel for the  
  
petitioner and learned Additional P.P. as well as learned counsel  
for the informant.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Athmalgola P.S.  
Case No. 128/2014, registered for the offences punishable under  
Sections 498(A), 315 of the Indian Penal Code and ¾ of Dowry  
Prohibition Act.

The wife of the petitioner made allegation that she was  
married to the petitioner on 31.05.2012, but immediately after  
marriage her husband got service in United India Insurance  
Company on the post of A.O. Thereafter her husband began to  
demand additional dowry and starting subjected her to physical

and mental torture.

Sri N.K. Argawal, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the mediation has been failed. The petitioner is ready to pay maintenance to his wife. Prior to lodging of this case the petitioner filed Matrimonial Suit No. 5183/2014 under Section 12(1)(c) of the Hindu Marriage Act for annulment of the marriage on the ground that in the negotiation of marriage there was concealment of facts, as the father of the informant showed his third daughter, but the petitioner was married with the informant.

On the other hand learned counsel for the informant submits that the informant is ready to live with her husband, but her husband on one pretext or the other tried to get rid of her.

Having considered the facts and nature of allegations made against the petitioner and the fact that the petitioner is not at all ready to keep his wife, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

**(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)**

Rakhi

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|