

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80909 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-456 Year-2018 Thana- KHAGARIA COMPALINT CASE
District- Khagaria

=====

RAJEEV SINGH @ RAJEEV MAHTO S/o Sarveshwar Mahto, R/o village-
Kamalpur, P.S. Ballia, Dist.-Begusarai

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Parvati Devi W/o Rajeev Singh @ Rajeev Mahto D/o Bhujangi Singh, R/o
village-Saharkundi, P.S. Mansi, Dist.-Khagaria

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Binod Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Ram Sevak Choudhary
For the Informant	:	Mr. Jai Kishor Poddar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

2 24-02-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the Complainant and learned APP for the State.

The petitioner has filed the instant application for grant of anticipatory bail apprehending his arrest in a case registered for the offence under sections 494 and 498A of the Indian Penal Code and sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

As per allegation in the Complaint, the petitioner was married to the O.P. No.2 on 07.07.2016. A boy and a girl were born out of the said wedlock. It is stated in the Complaint that the accused persons including the petitioner herein tortured the Complainant and ultimately the petitioner without obtaining



divorce, married a second time with accused no.8 Sukumari Devi on 12.11.2017.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the allegations of cruelty and torture etc. are false and concocted. It is further submitted that the petitioner has always been and is ready to keep the Complainant with full dignity and honour. It is stated that the case may be referred to the Patna High Court Mediation Centre to explore any chance of settlement between the parties.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the O.P. No.2 that the petitioner had married for a second time with the accused no.8 and thus there is no chance of any settlement. It is further submitted that from the order of the Court below dated 14.11.2019, it would transpire that the petitioner agreed to the fact that he had married for a second time.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail and as such the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.

The petitioner is directed to surrender in the court below within four weeks. In case the petitioner surrenders within the aforesaid time, the Court below shall



consider the application for bail without being prejudiced by
this order of rejection.

(Partha Sarthy, J.)

amit/-

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

