

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.52063 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -732 Year- 2010 Thana -NALANDA COMPLAINT CASE District-
NALANDA (BIHARSHARIFF)

=====

Rajeev Ranjan @ Dr. Rajeev Ranjan @ Dr. Rajiv Ranjan, Son of Ram
Lakhan Prasad, Resident of Village – Dailly, P.S. – Harnaut, District –
Nalanda.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Gitanjali, Wife of Dr. Rajeev Ranjan, Daughter of Suresh Chandra
Sinha, presently residing at Mohalla – Mathuriya, P.s. – Laheri, District
– Biharsharif (Nalanda).

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sandip Kumar Gautam

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Zainul Abedin

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

02/ 24-01-2018

The petitioner, being the husband of the complainant, has renewed the prayer for anticipatory bail in Complaint Case No. 732C of 2010, wherein processes have been directed to be issued after cognizance being taken for the offences punishable under Sections 498A, 323, 504, 379 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, pending in the Court of learned Sub-divisional Judicial Magistrate, Nalanda at Biharsharif.

Earlier the petitioner preferred Cr. Misc. No. 13176 of 2011, when on submission made on behalf of the petitioner that he is ready to keep the complainant as wife with full



dignity and honour, notice was issued to the complainant to appear on 09.05.2011 and the interim order was passed with direction to both, the petitioner and the complainant to appear before this Court on 04.07.2011 in person. On 04.07.2011, the petitioner reiterated the undertaking of taking the complainant to his place of employment at Chennai but on the joint prayer of the parties, the matter was adjourned to 29.08.2011. The petitioner did not appear on 29.08.2011, upon which the matter was adjourned for 21.09.2011, when the matter could not be listed but when the matter was taken up on 26.09.2011, the petitioner did not appear. Then as a last indulgence, the matter was adjourned for 19.10.2011. The petitioner chose not to appear on 19.10.2011 also, then the matter was again adjourned for 29.11.2011 with stipulation as a last indulgence. On 29.11.2011 the petitioner did not appear and it was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is not ready for reconciliation, whereupon Cr. Misc. No. 13176 of 2011 was rejected vide order dated 29.11.2011. The petitioner again renewed the prayer for anticipatory bail vide Cr. Misc. No. 44160 of 2011 which was disposed of vide order dated 18.01.2012.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is ready to settle the issue by way of



payment of one time settlement amount.

Considering the fact that earlier the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner was rejected on 29.11.2011, thereafter the second anticipatory bail application was also disposed of vide order dated 18.01.2012 and the 3rd attempt has been made by preferring the present application registered on 31.10.2017 on same set of facts, this Court is not inclined to interfere. Accordingly, this application is disposed of.

However, the present order will not preclude the learned Court below to consider the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner or to pass interim order to enable the parties to get the issue mediated, if the petitioner surrenders before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today.

(Dinesh Kumar Singh, J)

DKS/-

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

