

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1941 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-660 Year-2021 Thana- GARKHA District- Saran

ANNU PRASAD S/o Dinesh Prasad R/o Village- Mamarakpur, P.S.- Manjhi,
Distt- Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Jyoti Kumari W/o Annu Prasad, D/o Sheshnath Mahto R/o Village-
Servadih, P.S.- Garkha, Distt- Saran at Chapra.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Rajani Kumari, Advocate Mr. Vijay Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ramashray Roy, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 24-07-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A),
494 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Sections 3/4 of the
Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Vide order dated 12.07.2023, the petitioner and the
informant were directed to remain physically present before this
Court on 20.07.2023, but when the matter was taken up on
20.07.2023, the informant was present but the petitioner chose
not to appear, as such again the case was fixed for 24.07.2023
with a direction that again both the petitioner and the informant



shall remain physically present in the Court but today again the informant is present but the petitioner chooses not to appear.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite informing the petitioner about the orders of this Court, he willfully defies the same and chooses not to appear.

5. The petitioner and the informant were called before this Court in order to resolve the dispute but it appears that the petitioner is not interested in resolving the dispute rather intends to contest. The allegation against the petitioner is of assaulting the informant for non-fulfilling dowry demand and of having performed second marriage.

6. Since the petitioner is not willing to come before this Court, as such the Court has no option but to reject his application for grant of anticipatory bail, in the nature of allegations alleged in the FIR.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner in connection with Garkha P.S. Case No. 660 of 2021 is thus rejected

8. The personal appearance of informant is dispensed with.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishi/-

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

