

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.8124 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -53 Year- 2015 Thana -MAHILA P.S District- SUPAUL

=====

1. Ravi Ranjan Mehta @ Ravi Ranjan Kumar @ Ranjan Kumar, Son of Deo Kumar Mehta, resident of Village- Lalmanpatti, P.S.- Ratanpur, District- Supaul.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Narendra Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 28-06-2017 The matter was on board and the same has been taken up on the slip filed by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Heard learned counsels for the petitioner, informant and the State.

The petitioner has renewed the prayer for anticipatory bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498A,313,323,379,504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

The basic accusation is of torture for non fulfillment of dowry demands and getting the pregnancy terminated.

It appears from the earlier order dated 4.12.2015 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 44063 of 2015 that on joint prayer of the parties,



the matter was referred to the Mediation Centre of the State Legal Services Authority but the issue could not be reconciled. Though statement was made in paragraph 5 of the earlier anticipatory bail application that the petitioner and informant are co-villagers but they were in love and subsequently they performed marriage but before the court the factum of marriage was denied. However, it was submitted on behalf of the informant that though the informant and the petitioner were co-villagers but since they were in love with each other, they performed marriage.

The prayer has been renewed on the ground that since the petitioner and the informant are co villagers hence the claim of the marriage of informant with the petitioner appears to be improbable. However, learned counsel for the informant submits that the informant performed marriage with the petitioner and is still ready to resume the conjugal life.

Considering the fact that the prayer has been renewed on the same ground on which the earlier bail application was considered, this court is not inclined to revise the earlier order. However, keeping in view the fact that the factum of marriage is in dispute, let the learned court below consider the prayer of the petitioners for regular bail in case the petitioners surrenders within six weeks from today and prays for bail in connection



with Supaul (Mahila) P.S. Case No.53 of 2015 pending in the court of learned J.M. Supaul.

With the aforesaid observation/direction, this application stands disposed of.

(Dinesh Kumar Singh, J)

Anil/-

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

