

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18378 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-132 Year-2016 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Bhojpur

SONADHARI RAJAK Son of Late Vanshi Rajak Resident of Village-
Sewatha, Police Station- Sahar, District- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Dhanamukhi Devi Wife of Sonadhari Rajak, D/o Butan Rajak Resident of
Village- Perhap, P.S.- Sahar, District- Bhojpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anil Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ansar Ul Haque

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

6 15-07-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Bhojpur Mahila Police Station Case No.132 of 2016/G.R. No.1338
of 2016 registered under Sections 341, 323, 498(A), 504/34 and 323
of the Indian Penal Code besides Sections 3/4 of the Dowry
Prohibition Act, pending in the court of the Sub-Divisional Judicial
Magistrate, Bhojpur at Ara.

The accusation is of torturing the opposite party no.2 by
her husband (petitioner) and other in-laws for non-fulfillment of the
dowry demand of she-buffalo and also removing the opposite party
no.2 on 10.05.2012 from the matrimonial house after snatching her
personal belongings.



Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that while it is alleged in the complaint petition that the opposite party no.2 was removed by her husband and other in-laws from the matrimonial house on 10.05.2012 after snatching her personal belongings but the complaint petition, which is the basis of the F.I.R., was filed on 24.06.2015, i.e., after three years. In fact, after marriage, on much persuasion, the opposite party no.2 did not pay any heed to come at her matrimonial house and only to put undue pressure upon the petitioner and other in-laws, the opposite party no.2 lodged the complaint case, which is the basis of the present F.I.R. Further submission is that despite service of notice, the opposite party no.2 did not appear before the court of the learned Sessions Judge, Bhojpur at Ara, at the time of hearing of pre-arrest bail of the petitioner nor before this Court in the present case. The petitioner is still ready to keep the opposite party no.2 with full honour and dignity.

Having considered the facts and the circumstances of the case, the provisional anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner, above named, vide order dated 27.03.2019 passed by a Bench of this Court is, hereby, confirmed.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

P.S./-

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

