

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.54222 of 2018**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -43 Year- 2018 Thana -MAHILA P.S. District- PATNA

=====

Abhishek Ranjan, S/o Sri Umesh Lal Singh, R/o Village- Lahsuna, P.S.-  
Masaurhi, District- Patna. .... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar .... Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kanhaiya Prasad Singh, Sr. Advocate  
Mr. Birendra Kumar Singh, Advocate  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Pandey, Advocate  
For the informant : Mr. Jha, Advocate

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR**  
**UPADHYAY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      20-09-2018                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and State as  
well as informant.

The petitioner is custody in connection with Mahila  
P.S. case no. 43 of 2018 for the offence under Sections 420/509/34  
of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry  
Prohibition Act.

Allegation against the petitioner is that he did not  
turn up along with Barat for solemnization of marriage on the date  
fixed with the informant.

While granting anticipatory bail to the father of the  
petitioner, the Court has noted the willingness of the father of the  
petitioner for solemnization of marriage of his son with the  
informant, but the informant is not willing to join wedlock with  
the son of the petitioner. Under the aforesaid circumstances, the  
anticipatory bail was granted to the father of the petitioner.



In the present case Mr. Kanhaiya Prasad Singh, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner reiterated the same line of argument that the petitioner will not go against the wishes of his father, but in fact the problem is that the informant is not willing to join the wedlock with this petitioner.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant does not dispute the contention of Mr. Kanhaiya Prasad Singh that the informant is not willing to join the wedlock of the petitioner. However, he submits that in case, if materials surface in the instant case about payment of any amount, then the Court below may be directed to see that the money received by the accused persons may be refunded to the father of the informant.

Under the aforesaid circumstances, the petitioner, named above, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patna in connection with Mahila (Patna) P.S. case no. 43 of 2018. However, the Court below in the event of satisfaction of payment received by the accused may direct refund to the father of the informant.

**(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)**

Uday/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

