

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21278 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-76 Year-2024 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Bhojpur

Md. Asraf Ali @ Asraf Ali S/o Md. Misha Resident of Village- Agarsanda (Behra), P.S.- Ara Muffasil, District- Bhojpur at Ara

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Tamanna Praveen Wife of Md. Asraf Ali Resident of Village- Agarsanda (Behara), P.S.- Ara Muffasil, District- Bhojpur at Ara at present address- R/o Village- Bandha, P.S.- Bihiya, District- Bhojpur at Ara

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shyam Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

7 12-09-2025

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the O.P. No.2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No.76 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 498(A), 354, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code & Sections 3/4 D.P. Act.

3. The petitioner and the O.P. No.2, in compliance of the order dated 08.08.2025, are present in the Court.

4. The O.P. No.2, who is present in the Court, submits that petitioner is only buying time and does not have any intention of keeping her and the child with honour and dignity. It is further submitted that petitioner has performed his second marriage and earlier a panchayati was convened but then the



amount agreed was not paid. The O.P. No.2 also submits that one can well imagine her plight that how she is suffering in absence of financial support from the petitioner as she has a child to look after. It is also submitted that petitioner is enjoying his life with his second wife but then has left the O.P. No.2 and the child aged about 2 ½ years in lurch for the last more than two years and in these two years has not given any financial support, as such O.P. No.2 is suffering from immense mental trauma.

5. The petitioner, who is present in the Court, is not in a position to rebut the submission of the O.P. No.2 that he has performed his second marriage and is not taking care of the O.P. No.2 and the child for the last two years.

6. Considering the submission made by the O.P. No.2, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

