

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.4664 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -200 Year- 2016 Thana -PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
PATNA

=====

Arvind Mahto, Son of Nawasi Mahto, Resident of Village- Dhanakdhor,
P.S.- Ghoswari, District- Patna. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

2. Putul Devi, wife of Arvind Mahto, D/o Shyam Kishori Mahto, Resident
of Village- Dhanakdov, P.S.- Ghoswari, District- Patna, At present Resident
of Village and P.O.- Shahari, P.S.- Ghoswari, District- Patna.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Surendra Kumar Mishra

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sir Pramod Kumar Pandey

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN
SHARMA**

ORAL ORDER

3 20-06-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP representing the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Complaint Case no. 200 (C) of 2016 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 498A, 420, 406, 120B of the Indian
Penal Code and Sections 3 / 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

The complainant was married to the petitioner in the year
2014 though the petitioner was married one. The petitioner and
others snatched all the ornaments and articles of the complainant
and started torturing her and thereafter, the petitioner married with
Urmila Devi. The petitioner and others kept all the articles and
caused threats to the complainant and her family members.

Submission is of false implication and that the petitioner



is ready to keep the complainant as his wife with honour and dignity but the complainant is not ready to live with him and she wants money. The petitioner has not married with Urmila Devi and it is out and out a false and fabricated allegation. Other co-accused have been allowed bail and as such the petitioner also deserves sympathetic consideration.

Learned APP duly assisted by learned counsel for opposite party no. 2 opposes the prayer of pre-arrest bail by submitting that the petitioner is the husband and he has tortured the complainant and further snatched all the articles and ornaments and is not ready to keep the complainant with honour and dignity as he has married again with Urmila Devi.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, this Court is not persuaded to grant the privilege of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, accordingly, his such prayer stands rejected.

avin/-

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

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

