

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60239 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-875 Year-2020 Thana- PURNIA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Purnia

=====

KOSI LAL UROWN Son of Late Maghi Urown R/v- Sudin Chowk, P.S.-
K.Hat (Maranga), District- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. VEENA DEVI Wife of Kosi Lal Urown, D/o Late Shyam Lal Urown R/v-
Borni (Bhatoria), P.S.- Dandkhor, District- Katihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ram Prawesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Md. Shakir Ahmad, APP
For the informant	:	Mr. Kumar Praveen, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 22-05-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

The submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner appears to be fanciful for the reason that it has been submitted that the marriage is 20 years old and the informant after conceiving for the first time left the petitioner and came back 20 years thereafter with two more children and is staying in his house forcefully. It is next submitted that the petitioner accepts that the elder daughter is his but then the other two children are not his. It is further submitted that the informant only with a view to harass the petitioner has instituted this case 20 years after marriage.



Learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposes the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner are fit to be rejected at the outset for the reason that his conduct itself would demonstrate that the submissions are false for the reason that if the informant had left the petitioner after one year of marriage then the petitioner ought to have filed a case seeking restitution of conjugal rights or would have filed a divorce on the ground that the informant is not staying with him for the last more than 20 years and also on the ground that informant has children outside wedlock, it is next submitted that after the death of the father of the petitioner in 2018, the petitioner started selling the ancestral lands and indulged in enjoyment of various kinds which was objected by the informant and the children, but when they realized that all the property would be wasted and at the same time the petitioner was not taking care of the informant and the children and was also torturing her, as such the present case came to be instituted.

Learned counsel for the informant next submits that the informant is staying in the house with the petitioner but still submissions are being made on behalf of the petitioner that the informant was not residing with him for the last 20 years.



Learned counsel for the informant next submits that petitioner with a view to oust the informant and children from home, has partly got the electricity connection of the house disconnected.

The Court finds force in the submissions made by the learned counsel for the informant, as such is not persuaded to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

