

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.221 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -24 Year- 2016 Thana -MAHILA P.S. District- MADHEPURA

=====

1. Dinesh Mandal Son of Mithu Mandal Resident of Village - Arar
Bishanpur, Police Station - Gwalpara, District - Madhepura.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr. Kumar Uday Pratap, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

6 05-12-2017

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned

Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out of Madhepura Mahila Police Station Case No. 24 of 2016, disclosing offences under Sections 498(A), 494, 341 and 323/34 of the Indian Penal Code and 3/4 of the D.P. Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner, who is of clean antecedent, is innocent and has not committed any offence. In fact, the petitioner, happens to be husband of the informant, has never assaulted nor demanded any dowry from the informant. The petitioner is ready to keep the informant as wife with full honour and dignity and statement to that effect has been made in paragraph-12 of the petition. Hence,



the petitioner deserves the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that there is direct allegation of assault on account of non-fulfillment of demand of dowry against the petitioner. Moreover, the witnesses have supported the prosecution version.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of this petitioner is rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

brajesh/-

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

