

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4471 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-87 Year-2013 Thana- PIPRAKOTHI District- East Champaran

SONA LAL SHARMA @ SONE LAL SHARMA Son of Jata Thakuar
Resident of Village - Kishunpur, P.S.- Piprakothi, Dist.- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dhannjay Kumar No 2, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anil Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 03-03-2020 The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with S.Tr.
No. 661/2019 arising out of Piprakothi P.S. Case No. 87 of 2013,
registered for offences punishable under Sections 341, 498(A)/34 of
the Indian Penal Code and Section 3 /4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

Petitioner is husband of the informant and allegation
against him is of demand of dowry and subjecting her to torture and
cruelty. It further appears from the impugned order that he was
earlier granted provisional anticipatory bail by this Court vide order
dated 11.01.2016 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 58374/2015 and there was
direction that provisional bail of the petitioner will be confirmed on
the following eventualities (I) if the matrimonial harmony is
substantially restored (ii) if the informant appears before the learned
court below or (iii) if the informant gets reluctant to reconcile the
issue but it did not so. It appears that the petitioner that he has not
complied the order passed by this court and It further appears that



this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 30921 of 2016 vide order dated 19.09.2018 observed that the period of provisional anticipatory bail lapsed on 10.01.2017.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that he has been arrested in this case and has been in custody since 20.11.2019 and it is the informant, who does not want to reside with the petitioner rather she wants the petitioner to reside with her in her maike, for which, the petitioner was not ready.

Heard learned A.P.P. also.

Having heard both sides, it appears that provisional bail of the petitioner expired on 10.01.2017 and in spite of that he did not surrender rather he was arrested after almost two years, considering the conduct of the petitioner, at this stage, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. However, since the petitioner has been in custody, learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same within a period of six months and if the Trial is not concluded within the aforesaid period, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

sunilkumar/-

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

