

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44300 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-863 Year-2017 Thana- MUZFFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Muzaffarpur

SONU KUMAR SINGH Son of Late Ram Milan Singh Resident of Village -
Reva Pateri, P.S. - Saraiya, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Soni Devi Daughter of Ranjit Singh Resident of Village - Chainpur, P.S. -
Karja, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Priyesh Kumar, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Naresh Roy, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

5 25-07-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

Notice has been issued to the O.P. No.2 by the order dated
15.04.2022 which was received by the brother of the O.P. No.2.
Learned counsel for the petitioner has filed a jointness petition
stating therein that O.P. No.2 is living in jointness with her
brother. Accordingly, the notice is served validly upon O.P.
No.2.

The petitioner apprehend his arrest in a case registered for
the offence punishable under sections 498(A) of the I.P.C r/w
u/s 3, 4 of the D.P Act.

The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner
along with other co-accused persons mentally and physically



assaulted the informant due to the demand for dowry. It is further alleged that the accused persons turned out the informant from the matrimonial house after taking away all her articles.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case due to grudge. No such occurrence, in the manner as alleged, has ever taken place. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. It is submitted that the petitioner and his family members never made demand of dowry. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail by stating that there is a specific overt act against the petitioner.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, since there is a specific overt act against the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on his behalf is hereby rejected.

This application is accordingly, dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

shikha/-

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

