

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35595 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-133 Year-2020 Thana- BEGUSARAI TOWN District- Begusarai

AJAY KUMAR Son of Indradev Das Resident of Village - Sagi Gosaimath,
P.S. - Khodawandpur, District - Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Manoj Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Aditya Kumar No.1, Advocate
	:	Mr.Prem Kumar Jha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 12-07-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Begusarai Town P.S. Case No. 133 of 2020 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 504 and 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code read with Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that after marriage, she was subjected to torture both mentally and physically by her husband and his relatives for non-fulfillment of the dowry demand of Rs. 1 Lakh and a motorcycle.



Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, he never tortured the informant and is still willing to keep her with dignity and love.

Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant submits that vide order dated 24.12.2021, the matter was referred to the Patna High Court Mediation Centre to resolve the dispute between the parties and the case was directed to be listed after two months, thereafter the matter again came up on 02.03.2022 and the period of mediation was extended by further two months. On 05.05.2022, the matter was again heard and the period of mediation was extended by two months and the Court had also directed that no coercive steps would be taken against the petitioner in the meanwhile.

Learned counsel for the informant further submits that taking advantage of this Court's order, the petitioner never appeared before the Mediation and thus the mediation proceeding could not take place, it is next submitted that the informant appeared on each and every date before the Mediator but the petitioner never appeared for reasons best known to him



or for the reason that he just intended to hoodwink the Court by seeking an interim protection so that he does not get arrested and took advantage of the orders of the Court and was freely moving around.

Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the informant and the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

His prayer for anticipatory bail is thus rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishi/-

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

