

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38840 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-186 Year-2019 Thana- GOPALGANJ TOWN District-
Gopalganj

=====

BINOD KUMAR SINHA @ VINOD KUMAR SINHA, aged about 50 years,
Male, Son of Late Sita Ram Sah Resident of Mohalla- Ghuna Gali Ward No.
12, P.S.- Gopalganj, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Irshad Ahmad Khan. Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ramchandra Singh, A.P.P.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER**

3 20-09-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in
connection with Gopalganj P.S. Case No. 186 of 2019
registered under Sections 341, 323, 354(A)(B)(C), 504, 506,
509 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the court of
learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gopalganj.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it
is a case of false implication, according to him, the
petitioner and the informant had solemnized marriage but
because of protest from the family of the informant they
could not continue together. The petitioner has lodged a
case for restitution of conjugal rights. It is further submitted



that the present case is nothing but a reiteration of the earlier case lodged by the informant giving rise to Gopalganj Mahila P.S. Case No. 32/2018.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, as according to him, this petitioner is involved in repeated offence of similar nature. It is submitted that from the narration of the statement of the victim in the F.I.R. it would appear that she is being subjected to harassment by this petitioner with an oblique motive, hence, the petitioner does not deserve privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, whereunder this petitioner is said to be a teacher of an Institute where the informant was going to learn music and thereafter it is claimed by the petitioner that he had married to the informant but the informant has denied the same and is alleging continuous act on the part of the petitioner in harassing her as also finding that a case of similar nature was lodged by this informant against the petitioner, still the offences have been repeated as per allegations, this court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the



petitioner.

Prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is
refused and this application is dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Rajeev/-

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

