

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.2593 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -573 Year- 2013 Thana -NALANDA COMPLAINT CASE District-
NALANDA (BIHARSHARIFF)

=====

1. Manoj Ravidas, Son of Nanhaku Ravidas @ Nanku Mochi, Resident of
Village- Pachalowa, Police Station- Islampur, District- Nalanda.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Rinku Devi, Wife of Manoj Ravidas, Resident of Village- Pachalowa,
Police Station- Islampur, District- Nalanda, Present residing At Village-
Lodipur, Police Station- Chhabilapur, District- Nalanda.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Tej Narayan Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Parties : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh (APP)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA
ORAL ORDER

4 29-03-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Complaint Case No. 573-C of 2013, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 498A, 494, 504 of
the Indian Penal Code and Section 4 of the D.P. Act .

Complainant Rinku Devi was married with the
petitioner in the year 2007 and after marriage second marriage was
performed and after six months of second marriage the petitioner
and other in-laws started demanding cash of Rs. 70,000/-, gold
chain and cycle but due to non-fulfillment she was being tortured
and assaulted. In 2012, the complainant was operated for appendix



and all the expenses was done by her parents, the petitioner and other in-laws did not pay any amount. On 10.09.2012 all the accused persons including the petitioner assaulted her and tried to kill her and ousted from the in-laws house causing threats, resulting, the complainant along with her two years old daughter came to her parental house and when the father and others went for settlement of dispute the accused persons became angry and were not ready for compromise.

Submission is of false implication and that inspite of notice the opposite party no.2 has not appeared. The petitioner has been made victim of the circumstances, as he is the husband, there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner, the petitioner is ready to keep his wife with full honour and dignity but the complainant herself does not want to live with the petitioner and, as such, the petitioner deserves sympathetic consideration.

The learned A.P.P. opposes the prayer of pre-arrest bail by submitting that the petitioner is the husband of the complainant and he is responsible for the offences committed against the complainant.

In the facts and circumstances as stated above, considering the allegation attributed against the petitioner, I am



not inclined to grant privilege of pre-arrest bail to him and accordingly his such prayer stands rejected in connection with Complaint Case No. 573 (C) of 2013, pending in the Court of learned S.D.J.M., Hilsa, Nalanda.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J.)

Rajiv/-

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

