

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82507 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1423 Year-2017 Thana- MUZZFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Muzaffarpur

=====

AMARDEEP KUMAR @ RINKU Son of Late Raghvendra Mahto
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- BIRRAKH, P.S SURSANDH DISTRICT
SITAMARHI

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Khushbu Rani @ Kumari Khushbu @ Khushbu Kumari W/o Amardeep Kumar @ Rinku R/o vill - Birraakh, P.S. - Sursandh, Distt. - Sitamarhi at present C/o Sunil Kumar @ Sunil Prasad (Father), Mohalla - Soda Godown, Church Road Chandwara, P.S. - Town Muzaffarpur, Distt. - Muzaffarpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Upendra Kumar Chaubey
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

6 31-07-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner, learned Counsel for the informant-Opposite Party No. 2 and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 1423 of 2017, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. The allegation, as per the First Information Report, is that the marriage of the Opposite Party No. 2 was solemnized with the petitioner on 31.05.2014, the petitioner and other family members started demanding a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- and



after some time of marriage, a sum of Rs. 10,00,000/- as dowry from the father of the opposite party no. 2 and due to non-fulfillment of the said demand, the petitioner and other family members tortured the Opposite Party No. 2 physically as well as mentally.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. He next submits that the complainant used to pressurize the petitioner to live separately and leave his widow mother and unemployed brother. He next submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to keep the complainant with full dignity and honour.

5. Learned Counsel for the informant-Opposite Party No. 2 opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner as the petitioner is not willing to pay any living cost to the informant-Opposite Party No. 2.

6. After having heard learned Counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is the husband of the complainant against whom there is direct allegation and the complainant has supported her version in S.A., enquiry witnesses have also corroborated the factum as alleged in the complaint petition, I am not inclined to grant the



petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

