

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.7676 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -997 Year- 2014 Thana -JEHANABAD COMPLAINT CASE District-
JEHANABAD

=====

1. Awadh Kumar, Son of Sidheshwar Prasad alias Sidheshwar Yadav, Resident of Village- Banslodipur, Police Station- Kako, District- Jehanabad, Present House No. C-4/58A, Lane No.3, 'C' Block Saidatpur Bistar, Post Office- Gokalpuri, Police Station- Khajuri, (Karawal Nagar), District- Shahadra (Delhi-94). Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Sarita Kumari, Wife of Sri Awadh Kumar, Daughter of Ram Nath Yadav, Resident of Village- Banslodipur, Police Station- Kako, District- Jehanabad, At Present Village- Konika, Police Station- Arwal, District- Arwal. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Uday Narayan Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Parties : Mr. Smt. Reena Sinha (APP)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA
ORAL ORDER

3 24-04-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned counsel for the complainant and learned counsel representing the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 997 of 2014 (Tr. No. 175 of 2016), registered for the offence punishable under Section 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code.

The marriage of the complainant was solemnized with the petitioner in the year 2010 and thereafter she went to her *sasural* and after *Duragman*, she went to Delhi where, allegedly, the petitioner along with other co-accused persons had been harassing and torturing her for non fulfilling the demand of Hero



Honda motorcycle and gold chain and when on 05.11.2014 at about 3 P.M., the complainant's parents and brother visited Delhi for pacification where they were assaulted and the complainant was ousted from there after snatching her ornaments and clothes.

Submission is of false implication and that there is no specific allegation against him, he is always ready to keep the complainant but she fled away without obtaining any permission of in-laws. The petitioner is a labourer whereas the complainant is educated one and she does not want to live with the petitioner and, as such, the petitioner deserves sympathetic consideration.

The learned A.P.P. duly assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant opposes the prayer of pre-arrest bail.

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 to him and accordingly his such prayer stands rejected in connection with Complaint Case No. 997 of 2014 (Tr. No. 175 of 2016), pending in the Court of Shri Kishore Kunal, Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Arwal.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J.)

Rajiv/-

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

