

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81403 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-805 Year-2018 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Jamui

PINKU PANDIT Son of Late Chandrika Pandit Resident of Village- Aghara,  
P.S.- Sono, District- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner.

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR.
2. Ajanti Devi D/o Birendra Pandit Resident of Village- Pitochak, P.S.- Jhajha,  
District- Jamui.

... .. Opposite Parties.

**Appearance :**

|                              |   |                                |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner           | : | Mr. Md. Najmul Hoda, Advocate. |
| For the State                | : | Mr. Khurshid Anwar, A.P.P.     |
| For the Opposite Party No.2: | : | Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate.     |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

11    09-07-2021                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned A.P.P. for the State as also the learned counsel for the opposite party no.2, through Video Conferencing.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No.805C of 2018 registered under Section 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, pending in the court of the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Jamui.

The accusation is of torturing the opposite party no.2 by her husband (petitioner) and other in-laws for non-fulfillment of the dowry demand and removing the opposite party no.2 from her matrimonial house after causing assault.



Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner, who is the husband of the opposite party no.2, is ready to keep his wife (opposite party no.2) with full honour and dignity. Further submission is that, at present, the petitioner is at Hyderabad, due to that reason, the petitioner could not approach his wife (opposite party no.2) to take her from her Maika to his house.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 submits that, earlier, on the prayer of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the matter was adjourned for 06.07.2021 so that the petitioner may approach his wife (opposite party no.2) to take her from her Maika to his house but till date, the petitioner has not approached his wife (opposite party no.2) to take her from her Maika to his house.

It appears that in spite of seeking adjournment, the petitioner did not pay any heed to approach his wife (opposite party no.2) to take her from her Maika to his house.

Having considered the facts and the circumstances of the case and the nature of allegation against the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail stands rejected. However, the petitioner is



directed to surrender before the trial court within four weeks from today and pray for regular bail, which shall be considered by the trial court in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

**(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)**

P.S./-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

