

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6141 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-337 Year-2020 Thana- SITAMARHI District- Sitamarhi

SUNNY ALAM S/o Md. Anwar @ Gaddu Resident of Mohalla- Tinkothiya,
P.S.- Mithanpura, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Suraiya Pravin W/o Sunny Alam and Daughter of Md. Salim At present resident of Mirchai Patti Islampur Road Ward No.-9, P.S. and District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar @ S.K., Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Suresh Prasad Singh, A.P.P.
For the informant	:	Mr. Anant Kumar Mishra, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

7 20-12-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 498A and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

The case was mentioned by the learned counsel for the informant for taking it up out of turn in view of the liberty granted to the informant by order dated 7.12.2022.

When the matter was taken up on 7.12.2022, the petitioner and the informant both were present in the Court, the petitioner made a very categorical statement that he intends to



resume his conjugal relationship and is willing to keep the informant with dignity and honour and would keep his wife and son with due love and care, the informant even was ready to resume her conjugal relationship and was willing to accompany the petitioner. The petitioner, further, submitted that he will personally go on the 14th of this month to bring her back to her matrimonial home.

Learned counsel for the informant submits that despite giving undertaking to this Court, the petitioner did not go to bring the informant and the child along with him. This amply demonstrates the intention of the petitioner that he only intended to mislead the Court with a view to seek bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has instructions to make submissions that petitioner is not willing to resume his conjugal relationship.

In view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

