

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81439 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-579 Year-2018 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - JHANJHARPUR
District- Madhubani

=====

Amit yadav @ Amit Kumar yadav S/o Basudev Yadav R/o vill - Nainpatti,
P.S. - Phulparas, Distt.- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Lalti devi W/o Amit Yadav @ Amit Kumar Yadav R/o vill - Nainpatti, P.S. -
Phulparas, Distt.- Madhubani. Presently D/o Ramphal Yadav, Vill -
Chichorba (Chichodhaba), P.S. - Laukahi, Distt.- Madhubani

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Hriday Narayan Harshit, Advocate
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Bimal Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Kumar Ranjit Ranjan, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 17-04-2025 Heard Mr. Hriday Narayan Harshit, learned counsel

for the petitioner, Mr. Bimal Kumar, learned counsel for the

Complainant and Mr. Kumar Ranjit Ranjan, learned APP for

the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Jhanjharpur C.R. No. 579 of 2018, dated
13.09.2018 registered for the offences punishable under Section
323, 342, 379, 498(A)/34 of the Indian Penal Code but the
learned Court below has taken cognizance under Sections 323,
498(A)/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry
Prohibition Act.



3. Petitioner is the husband of the Complainant. Allegation against the petitioner is of demand of dowry and torture for the same.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has clean antecedent and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the allegation as alleged in the complaint petition is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the complaint petition.

5. Learned counsel for the Complainant as well as learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that before the filing of the present anticipatory bail petition before the learned Court below, process under Section 82 of the Cr. P.C. had been issued against the petitioner on 05.08.2024 itself.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, the present anticipatory bail petition is not maintainable. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Ibrar//-

U			
---	--	--	--

