

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48270 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-52 Year-2023 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Aurangabad

=====

AJIT KUMAR YADAV, SON OF LATE SHEO NANDAN YADAV,
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- DOSMA, PS- DEO DISTRICT-
AURANGABAD

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1. THE STATE OF BIHAR
- 2. ANITA DEVI, DAUGHTER OF AJIT KUMAR YADAV, RESIDENT OF
VILLAGE- TILAUTA BIGHA, PS- DEO, DISTRICT- AURANGABAD

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binod Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Suresh Prasad Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

2 07-08-2024

- 1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
- 2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of anticipatory bail apprehending his arrest in connection with Aurangabad Mahila P.S. Case no. 52 of 2023 registered under sections 498A, 341, 323, 504, 506, 494 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
- 3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that she was married to the petitioner herein in the year 2007 and a daughter was born out of the said wedlock in the year 2014. The petitioner works as a Loco Pilot in the Indian



Railways. He subsequently married for a second time. The informant further states that the accused persons started to abuse, assault and torture the informant and started asking for a Brezza car by way of dowry.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. His marriage with the informant was solemnized as far back as in the year 2007. It was at the instance of and as a result of pressure by the informant that the petitioner entered into a second marriage. Subsequently, the petitioner has been punished in the sense that he has been dismissed from his service of the Indian Railways. He has no criminal antecedent and undertakes to cooperate in the case.

5. The application for anticipatory bail is opposed by learned APP for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the allegations against the petitioner in the F.I.R. wherein it is stated that the petitioner has entered into a second marriage and which allegation has been substantiated leading to the departmental action against the petitioner in the Indian Railways, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail and the application is rejected.



7. The petitioner is directed to surrender in the learned
Court below within a period of four weeks.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

avinash/-

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

