

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47423 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-305 Year-2021 Thana- MADHEPURA COMPALINT CASE
District- Madhepura

=====

Dilkhush Kumar, Son of Naresh Sah @ Naresh Kumar Sah, Resident of Vill-
Sigheshar, Ward No. 02, P.S.- Madhepura, District- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Kumari Juli @ Juli Devi @ Juli Kumari Wife Of Dilkhush Kumar Daughter
Of Bablu Sah Resident Of Vill- Sigheshar, Ward No. 02, P.S.- Madhepura,
District- Madhepura, Presently Residing At Vill- Kashipur, Ward No.- 02,
Murliganj, P.S.- Murliganj, District- Madhepura.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Dr. Sanjay Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Rajesh Kumar
	Mr. Uday Chand Prasad
	Mr. Niraj Kumar
	Ms. Pooja Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 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.305 of 2021 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 498A, 504, 506
and 34 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 on
27.08.2024, when an undertaking was given on behalf of the



petitioner that petitioner intends to keep the opposite party no.2 with honour and dignity and hence, would go to the parental home of the opposite party no.2 on 30.08.2024 to fetch her back to her matrimonial home, but then, it is submitted that petitioner never came to the parental home of the opposite party no.2, though opposite party no.2 was ready and willing to accompany the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that he had gone to the house of the opposite party no.2 on 30.08.2024, but then, he was abused by the opposite party no.2 and her family members, as such, he was not able to bring her back to her matrimonial home, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no.2 submits that a false submission has been made. It is next submitted that it is asserted that petitioner never came to the parental home of the opposite party no.2 for fetching her back. It is also submitted that had the petitioner come to the house of the opposite party no.2 for fetching her back, in that event, at least he would have made a video of the occurrence of abuse as being alleged, but then, that is not the case, which amply demonstrates that only for the purposes of seeking stay, a false undertaking was given to the Court that petitioner intends to keep the



opposite party no.2 with honour and dignity.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no.2, 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	
---	--	---	--

