

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20903 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2510 Year-2019 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

KRISHNA MURARI SINGH SON OF SRI RATNESH KUMAR SINGH
R/O VILLAGE- DHARMPUR DAKHILI, P.S.- O.P. HALAI, P.O.- KESHO
NARAYANPUR, DISTRICT- SAMASTIPUR, AT PRESENT POSTED AS
OPERATING GOODS CONTROLLER, MANDAL RAIL PRABANDHAK
OFFICE, SONEPUR- OPERATING CONTROL ROOM, SONEPUR
(SARAN) PIN-841101.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. HEHA KUMARI @ NEHA SINGH WIFE OF KRISHNA MURARI
SINGH R/O VILLAGE- DHARMPUR DAKHILI, P.S.- O.P. HALAI, P.O.-
KESHO NARAYANPUR, DISTRICT- SAMASTIPUR, AT PRESENT
RESIDING AT SANJAY NIWAS , THIRD FLOOR, KANNULAL ROAD,
MITHAPUR, P.S.- JAKKANPUR, DISTRICT- PATNA.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Alok Chaubey
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pranav Kumar
Mr.Syed Mojibur Rahman

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 18-04-2022 Heard learned counsels for the petitioner and the

State.

Petitioner apprehend arrest in connection with

Complaint Case No. 2510 (c) of 2019 registered for the

offence punishable under sections 498A, 323, 504 and 506

of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner

submits that petitioner has not committed any offence as

alleged in the first information report and he has been

falsely implicated in this case. The complainant's marriage was forced one and she was in love and wanted to marry another person namely Ajay. Petitioner has never demanded any dowry nor tortured her ever. The complainant is at present residing with this petitioner. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that petitioner is named accused in the first information report and there is direct allegation of demand of dowry and torture against him. Moreover, petitioner being the husband had the responsibility of keeping his wife with full honour and dignity, in which he failed. Petitioner, therefore, does not deserve to be granted the privilege of bail.

Considering the nature of allegations levelled, the materials available on record and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The same is, therefore, rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

mcv/-

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