

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.44891 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -1598 Year- 2013 Thana -BEGUSARAI COMPLAINT CASE District-
BEGUSARAI

=====

Rajnish Kumar @ Deepu, Son of Sri Nandlal Sah, Resident of Village- New
Taridih, Bhagalpur, P.S.- Bodhgara, District- Gaya.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Deepa Kumari, Daughter of Mahavuir Sao, Resident of Village- Chatti
Road, P.S. Begusarai, District- Begusarai.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Chandra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Smt. Anita Kumari Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR
JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-10-2017 Heard both sides.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in Complaint Case
No.1598C of 2013 of 2016 under Section 498A and other Sections
of the Indian Penal Code.

The prayer for anticipatory bail petition of the
petitioner was earlier rejected vide order dated 7.7.2017 passed in
Cr. Misc. No.15614 of 2017.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on the
earlier occasion, his anticipatory bail petition was rejected on the
ground that the petitioner had already solemnized second marriage
but the petitioner had not solemnized second marriage. It is
submitted that the petitioner alleged that the complainant
solemnized second marriage. It is further submitted that from



perusal of the complaint petition itself, it would appear that the first occurrence took place on 10.10.2011 and her husband and other in-laws took her to Begusarai for treatment on a vehicle but after snatching of ornaments she was pushed out from the vehicle but she did not lodge the case at the relevant time. Therefore, it appears that the entire allegation made in the complaint petition is false but I find from the order dated 7.7.2017 that the prayer for anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner was rejected only on the ground that the petitioner solemnized second marriage and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant stated the same facts but the same was not controverted by the learned counsel for the informant. Now the learned counsel for the informant has filed this second petition for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that he had not solemnized second marriage and at the same time made allegation that his wife has solemnized second marriage.

Considering the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the same is once again rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

N.H./-

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

