

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66281 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-379 Year-2022 Thana- AMAS District- Gaya

=====

DHARMENDRA YADAV @ DHARMENDRA KUMAR SON OF LATE
SHIV YADAV RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- MAULANA CHAK, PS- AMAS,
DISTT- GAYA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. PRIYA KUMARI WIFE OF DHARMENDRA YADAV @ DHARMENDRA
KUMAR RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- MAULANA CHAK, PS- AMAS,
DISTT- GAYA

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Md. Javed Jafar Khan
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Pradeep Narain Kumar
For the O.P. No. 2	:	Mr. Kunwar Narayan Jamuar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 29-04-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State along with learned counsel appearing

on behalf of the O.P. No. 2.

2. In compliance of the order dated 23.04.2024, the
petitioner and the O.P. No. 2 are physically present in the Court.

3. The O.P. No. 2, who is present in the Court,
submits that petitioner has not approached this Court with clean
hands. It is further submitted that petitioner was earlier
implicated in a case of murder in which he is on bail, but then
from perusal of Para-3 to the anticipatory bail application, it
would manifest that the same records that petitioner is a person
with clean antecedent.

4. On query of the Court from the learned counsel
appearing on behalf of the petitioner that as to whether



petitioner is a person with clean antecedent or has criminal antecedent, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner inquired from the petitioner and thereafter submitted that petitioner is implicated in a case of murder, but then he is on bail.

5. At this stage, the O.P. No. 2 submits that she along with the child is staying separately from the petitioner for more than one and a half years and in these one and a half years, the petitioner has not paid a single penny to the O.P. No. 2 towards maintenance, as such, one can well imagine the plight of the O.P. No. 2 how she is surviving along with the child in absence of any financial support.

6. Since the petitioner has not approached the Court with clean antecedent and he has not paid even a single penny towards maintenance to the O.P. No. 2 and child, as such, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

