

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29950 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-62 Year-2020 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Buxar

MUNNA KUMAR S/o Mithilesh Prasad R/o village- Inrpatpur, P.S.- Piro,  
District- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Aarti Kumari D/o Bijay Singh R/o Baligaon P.S Rajpur Distt. Rohtas .

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Prabhat Kumar Singh  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      26-04-2022                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State.

The instant application for anticipatory bail has been filed by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Buxar Mahila P.S. Case no. 62 of 2020 instituted for the offence punishable under Sections 376, 420, 504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

As per allegation in the FIR, marriage of the informant was fixed with the petitioner and ring ceremony was performed on 17.12.2019. Petitioner had called the informant at Patna for shopping of marriage and booked a room in a hotel showing their identity as husband and wife . It is further alleged



that petitioner had established physical relation with her on the pretext of marriage.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. Petitioner has not committed any sexual assault to the informant. Informant herself is a police personnel. In fact, there was some difference in the opinion of their parents, so petitioner has been made scapegoat.

Learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the prayer of bail and submitted that in para nos. 6, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of the case diary, several witnesses have supported the prosecution story. It is further submitted that processes under Sections 82 and 83 of the Cr.P.C. have been issued against the petitioner. It is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration that processes u/s 82 and 83 have already been issued against the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant bail to him and, as such, his application for bail stands rejected.

**(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)**

sushma/-

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

