

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77553 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1127 Year-2017 Thana- VAISALI COMPLAINT CASE District-
Vaishali

=====

RANJEET KUMAR SON OF SHIV SHANKAR SINGH RESIDENT OF
VILLAGE - RAUDI POKHAR, P.S. - LALGANJ, DISTRICT - VAISHALI

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. SONI KUMARI WIFE OF RANJEET KUMAR, DAUGHTER OF
SANJEEV KUMAR SINGH RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - RAUDI
POKHAR, P.S. - LALGANJ, DISTRICT - VAISHALI, AT PRESENT
RESIDING AT BEDAULIYA, P.S. - VAISHALI (BELSAR O.P.),
DISTRICT - VAISHALI

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Sagarika
For the State	:	Ms.Gulnar Begum
For O.P. No. 2	:	NONE

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 4 31-07-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.
2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out
of Complaint Case No. 1127 of 2017, in which
cognizance has been taken for the offences punishable
under Sections 498-A/34 of the Indian Penal Code and
Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.
3. The prosecution case, as per the complainant, is that the
marriage of the complainant was solemnized with the
petitioner in the year 2016. After the marriage, the



accused persons started demanding Alto Car as dowry and due to non-fulfillment of demand, the complainant was subjected to cruelty and torture. Subsequently, the complainant was ousted from her matrimonial home.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case due to marriage discord between the parties. The petitioner is the husband of the complainant. The complainant was not willing to marry the petitioner and was having some affair with another boy. Due to the family pressure, the family members tied the knot of the complainant with the petitioner. The petitioner was ready to keep the complainant as wife. A case, under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act was filed by the petitioner, in which the Principal Judge, Family Court, Vaishali, at Hajipur, directed the complainant to live with the petitioner but she did not come to live with the husband despite consent given in the Court.
5. Notice was issued to the Opposite Party No. 2 by this Court, but despite service of notice, she did not turn up.
6. Regards being had to the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the fact that



the allegation against the petitioner, along with other accused persons, is general and omnibus in nature due to marriage discord and despite service of notice, the complainant did not turn up, I am inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.

- 7. This application is, accordingly, allowed.
- 8. Let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of four weeks from today, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Vaishali, at Hajipur, in connection with Complaint Case No. 1127 of 2017, subject to the condition laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Raj Ranjan/-

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

U	√	T	√
---	---	---	---

