

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 50684 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-567 Year-2018 Thana- NAWADAH COMPLAINT CASE
District- Nawada

=====

SURAJ PANDIT Son of Ram Bilash Pandit Resident of Village -
Shokhodewra, P.S. - Kawakol, District - Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR
2. Pratima Devi Wife of Suraj Pandit Resident of Village - Ranhan, P.O.-
Mahadev Simariya, P.S.- Sikandra, District - Jamui. At present and Naiher
vill.- Pharheda, P.S.- Rupao, District - Nawada.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Sinha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bhanu Pratap Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

3 27-11-2019 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and

the learned A.P.P. for the State.

This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail
in connection with complaint case no. 567 of 2018 registered for
the offences punishable under Section 498A and other sections
of IPC.

The allegation against the petitioner who is the
husband of the complainant is regarding the petitioner and other
accused persons having tortured the complainant on account of
non-fulfilment of the demand for dowry.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
there is general and omnibus allegation levelled against the



petitioner and the petitioner has never tortured the complainant, as such he be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials on record. This Court had put a query to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that as to whether he wants to keep his wife with due dignity and honour, to which the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is not ready to keep her wife i.e. the complainant herein with him. Again, this Court had put a query to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that as to whether the petitioner is ready to give some succour to his wife i.e. the complainant by way of paying her some maintenance amount per month, whereupon the learned counsel had prayed for keeping the matter after lunch recess so that he can take instructions. The present case was again taken up for hearing after recess and the learned counsel for the petitioner, upon instructions, has flatly refused to grant even a single penny by way of maintenance to the complainant i.e. the wife of the petitioner herein.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the materials on record, this Court is of the view that considering the attitude of the petitioner, it would



not be in the interest of justice to grant privilege of anticipatory
bail to the petitioner, hence the present petition stands rejected.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

rinkee/-

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

