

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35083 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1462 Year-2016 Thana- MUZFFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Muzaffarpur

=====

SUDHIR KUMAR VERMA Son of Bipin Bihari Verma Resident of Village - Khabra, (Near Middle School), P.S.- Sadar, Distt - Muzaffarpur, Presently residing at House No. 216, Gali No. 5, Jharoda Part II, P.S.- Burari, North Delhi, Delhi - 110084.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR
2. Minakshi Devi Wife of Kumar Verma, D/o Bhavesh Sharan Resident of Mohalla - Bhavani Nagar, Bhagwanpur, P.S.- Sadar, Distt - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Lakshmi Kant Sharma
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Yogendra Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

6 26-09-2019 Petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 1462 of 2016, corresponding to Trial No. 2803 of 2017, in which cognizance has been taken under Section 498A IPC and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, pending in the court of S.D.J.M., East, Muzaffarpur.

Allegation as per complaint petition is that petitioner subjected the complainant to torture with respect to demand of one Alto car. It further appears that father of complainant tried to pacify the dispute but the accused persons are adamant on the demand of Alto car and for that she was subjected to torture and



she was driven out from the house.

In this case several efforts have been taken for reconciliation between the parties by the court below but in spite of much efforts it appears that accused persons are adamant for one time settlement and not interested to continue marital relationship with opposite party No.2, as such reconciliation failed.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the occurrence is of the year 2016 and there is delay in lodging the complaint case and he is still ready for one time settlement and in such prevailing circumstance there does not appear to be any chance to live the parties together. On the other hand, learned counsel for opposite party No.2 has submitted that she is always ready to reside with the petitioner but petitioner is not ready to keep her and he subjected her to cruelty and torture with respect to demand of Alto car and witnesses have also supported the case of opposite party No.2.

Heard learned APP also.

In view of above facts and circumstances and also considering the conduct of the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. He may surrender and pray for regular bail, which shall be considered on



its own merit and without being prejudiced by this order.

Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

spal/-

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

