

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.31556 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1 Year-2018 Thana- LALGANJ District- Vaishali

=====

Ravi Ranjan Kumar @ Guddu @ Guddu Kumar S/o Ranjit Rai Resident of
Village - Gopinathpur, Dokra, P.S. - Saraiya, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pawan Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-06-2018 Heard learned counsels for the petitioner and the

State.

Petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
Lalganj P.S. Case No. 1 of 2018 registered for the offence
punishable under sections 341, 323, 504, 506 and 498A/34 of
the Indian Penal Code and sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition
Act.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner
submits that petitioner never married with the informant. As a
matter of fact, father of the petitioner had lodged a Sanha
(Annexure-2) for searching out the petitioner, who was caught
by Bablu Kumar. Petitioner has also lodged a complaint case
against the informant and her family members vide Annexure-3
stating therein that he was forcibly taken away by Bablu Kumar



and was further forced to solemnize marriage with the informant.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail. He submits that petitioner was married with the informant and now he is denying his marriage. From the impugned order, it appears that the Court below has taken note of the fact that there was talk in between the petitioner and the informant before marriage and even after marriage. Photographs of marriage were also taken note of. He, therefore, submits that petitioner does not deserves to be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the nature of allegations levelled, the materials available on record and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The same is, therefore, rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

mcv/-

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

