

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.38900 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -202 Year- 2014 Thana -NAWADAH COMPLAINT CASE District-
NAWADA

=====

1. Rajendra Chauhan S/o Ram Pyare Chauhan Resident of Village Lakshmi
pur, P.S. Sitamarhi, District Nawada.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Pinki Kumari D/o Shree Ramji Chauhan Resident of Village Lakshmipur,
P.S. Sitamarhi, District Nawada.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Mishra
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pronati Singh(App)

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN
SHARMA**
ORAL ORDER

2 01-04-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel representing the State and learned counsel for the
complainant.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Complaint Case No. 202 of 2014 in which cognizance has been
taken under Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code and Section 4
of Dowry Prohibition Act.

Allegedly, the petitioner was married with the
complainant against the wishes of the parents, lastly, the father of
the complaint lodged a case bearing Narhat (Sitamarhi) P.S. Case
No. 25 of 2013 against the petitioner and his family members and

after recording the statement under Section 164 Cr.P.c. of the victim bail was granted and thereafter, the petitioner and others started demanding Rs. 3,00,000/- by way of dowry and due to non-fulfillment started torturing her in various ways and further assaulted her and ousted her from the matrimonial house after snatching her all belongings.

Submission is of false implication and that no such occurrence has taken place, the complainant is a married lady and she is wife of one Pramod Chauhan and the petitioner is a Railway employee under training and he was never married with the complainant to which the learned APP duly assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant opposes by submitting that in Narhat P.S. Case No. 25 of 2013 the petitioner has not denied the marriage with the complainant.

Considering that the petitioner being husband of the complainant tortured her due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, this Court is not persuaded to grant the privilege of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, accordingly, his such prayer stands rejected.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

avin/-

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