

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.29474 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -15 Year- 2017 Thana -MAHILA P.S. District- PATNA

=====

1. Ravi Kumar Sah, S/o Sri Dilip Kumar Sah, R/V- Kanu Tola, Sautadih,
P.S.- Belhar, Distt.- Banka.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Akbar Ali

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-07-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State and
also heard learned counsel, appearing for the informant (opposite Party
No. 2).

The petitioner seeks bail in Mahila P.S. Case No. 15 of
2017 instituted for the offence under Sections-498A & other minor
Sections of the Indian Penal Code.

It is alleged in the written report that the petitioner
performed inter caste marriage with the informant and after sometime,
he started committing torture with her for demand of dowry.

It has been submitted that earlier also the informant filed a
case against the petitioner vide Pirbahore P.S. Case No. 181 of 2015 in
which, the petitioner has entered into compromise with the informant
and on that ground, he was granted bail but after grant of bail, the
petitioner again started torturing her after calling her bad names.



It is alleged in the instant case that this petitioner took the informant to her Sasural and kept her there for some days where she became pregnant and, thereafter, he started putting pressure for miscarriage and caused physical and mental torture with her. Finally, he ousted the informant and she finally gave birth to a male child but the petitioner did not take care either of the informant or the child. The informant is still living in “Baseria” run by Gramin and Nagar Vikas along with her five months old child and the petitioner is not taking care of them

In such circumstances, keeping in view the conduct of the petitioner and the torture complained by the informant, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, prayer for bail is rejected.

The trial court is directed to expedite the trial of the petitioner and try to conclude the same as early as possible, preferably, within six months from, the date of receipt of the order. In the event, the trial is not concluded within the above-said period of six months, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail in the court below and in that event, the court below will give reason in said order for not concluding trial within aforesaid period.

(Sanjay Priya, J)

A.K.V./-

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

