

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45263 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1870 Year-2022 Thana- VAISALI COMPLAINT CASE
District- Vaishali

Pradeep Kumar S/O Sita Ram Paswan R/O Village- Mansurpur Kushar, P.S-
Mahua, Distt.- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Chandni Kumari W/O Pradeep Kumar R/O Village- Mansurpur Kushar, P.S-
Mahua, Distt.- Vaishali. Presently Residing At D/O Kamal Paswan, Of
Village- Samastipur Jhitkahi, Post- Baksama, P.S- Goraul, Distt.- Vaishali.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Awadhesh Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Nagendra Prasad
	Mr.Nafisuzzoha
	Ms.Shabina Talat
	Mr.Md. Mahtab Ali
	Mr.Alammanour

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 02-09-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the

learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant and

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his

arrest in Complaint Case No.1870 of 2022, Trial No.377 of

2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323

and 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

opposite party no.2 submits that the case was taken up

27.08.2024, when an undertaking was given by the petitioner



that he will go and fetch the opposite party no.2 back from her parental home to her matrimonial home on 30.08.2024, but then, petitioner never came to fetch the opposite party no.2 from her parental home on 30.08.2024, which amply demonstrates that petitioner only with an intention to seek stay, gave a false undertaking before this Court.

4. On query of the Court from the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that as to whether petitioner had gone to the house of the opposite party no.2 on 30.08.2024 to fetch her back to her matrimonial home, on which it is submitted that petitioner did not go to the parental home of the opposite party no.2.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

