

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4664 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-164 Year-2012 Thana- SINGHWARA District- Darbhanga

Jafar Nadaf @ Md. Jafar Imam Mansuri, Son Of Late Md. Izhar R/O Village-
Bhapura, P.S.- Singhwara, Dist.- Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Yasmin Pravin, W/O Jafar Nadaf @ Md. Jafar Imam Mansuri, D/O Abdul Kalam R/O At Present - Ekdara Aghari, P.S.- Katra, Dist.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Saurav Anand

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sunil Kumar Pandey

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 07-10-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in Singhwara P. S. Case No.164 of 2012 registered for the offences punishable under Section 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from perusal of the office report dated 30.09.2024, it would manifest that the same records that the opposite party no.2 refused to receive the registered notice. Since registered notice has been refused, as such, the notice is deemed to have been validly served.



4. At this stage, the learned A.P.P. submits that the case is of the Year 2012 and the petitioner had moved the learned District Court seeking anticipatory bail in the Year 2023 and the same came to be rejected on 14.12.2023 and thereafter, the instant anticipatory bail application has been filed. The learned A.P.P. next submits that petitioner at his leisure has moved this Court seeking anticipatory bail. The learned A.P.P. further submits that it is an admitted fact that opposite party no.2 is not staying with the petitioner for the last more than 12 years and from pleadings made in the anticipatory bail application, it appears that even petitioner has not taken any steps for restituting his conjugal rights by filing any application before a Court of competent jurisdiction. The learned A.P.P. further submits that from perusal of the order impugned, it would also manifest that earlier the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner was rejected by the learned District Court in A.B.P. No.686 of 2012, but still the petitioner never approached this Court against the order rejecting his anticipatory bail application and thus, it is submitted that he is moving at his leisure.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submission of the



learned A.P.P. that anticipatory bail application of the petitioner was earlier rejected in the Year 2012 by the learned District Court.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

