

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.41404 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-747 Year-2022 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - HILSA District-
Nalanda

=====

Mukesh Pandit S/o- Ramashish Pandit Resident of Kotawan, Police Chowki,
P.S. - Lauhata, District - Baranasi, Uttar Pradesh

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Manisha Kumari D/o- Sanjay Pandit Village- Islampur Patel Nagar Ps-
Islampur Dist- Nalanda Matrimonial R/v- Isua Ps- Sarmera Presently
Kotawan Po- Karaut Ps- Lauhata Dist- Banarasi U.P

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Rajnish Kumar, Adv.
For the informant	:	Ms. Sushma Kumari, Adv. Mr. Sanjeet Kumar, Adv. Mr. Bhim Sen Prasad, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Damodar Prasad Tiwary, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

3 03-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No. 747C of 2022 registered
for the offences punishable u/ss 498A and 323 of the Indian
Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the D.P. Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner and the
co-accused persons are alleged to have tortured the informant
mentally and physically due to non-fulfillment of demand of



dowry. It is further alleged that the accused persons tried to commit murder of the informant by pouring kerosene oil on her body.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner is the husband of the informant and he has no concern with the alleged offence. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel has further submitted that the instant anticipatory bail application is not maintainable and from perusal of the impugned order dated 20.05.2025, as the process u/s 82 of the Cr.P.C. has already been issued against the petitioner. The petitioner is declared a proclaimed offender. Learned counsel has further relied upon the case of *(Abhishek vs. State of Maharashtra (2022) 14 SCC 529)* where it was held that “*As regards the implication of proclamation having been issued against the appellant, we have no hesitation in making it clear that any person, who is declared*



as an 'absconder' and remains out of reach of the investigating agency and thereby stands directly at conflict with law, ordinarily, deserves no concession or indulgence." Reliance has further been placed on the decisions of (***Lavesh vs. State (NCT of Delhi)***) (2012) 8 SCC 730, ***Adri Dharan Das vs. State of W.B.*** (2005) 4 SCC 303) and (***Prem Shankar Prasad vs. State of Bihar*** 2021 SCC Online SCC 955) and in the case of (***State of Haryana vs. Dharamraj*** (Cr. Appeal No. 2635 of 2023 @ out of SLP (Cri.) No. 2256 of 2022, reported in 2023 LiveLaw (SC) 739: 2023 INSC 784) disposed of 29.08.2023 wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that: "*Anticipatory bail can be granted to a person to a proclaimed offender only in exceptional and rare case.*" It is further submitted that the materials available on the record do not reveal any exceptional or rare case due to which the plea of anticipatory bail may be considered. Learned counsel has further relied upon the case of **Srikant Upadhyay & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar & Anr.** reported in 2024 INSC 202, the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide para-24 of the said judgment has been pleased to hold that "*at any rate, when warrant of arrest or proclamation is issued, the applicant is not entitled to invoke the extraordinary power*".

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances



of the case as well as the petitioner having been declared a proclaimed offender, the anticipatory bail petition is not maintainable. Accordingly, the same is disposed of with direction to the petitioner to surrender before the Court below concerned within six weeks from the date of this order and the prayer for regular bail and the learned Court below may consider his prayer for regular bail in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

7. The application stands disposed of.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Gautam/-

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

