

IN THE COURT OF SATYA BHUSHAN ARYA, SESSIONS JUDGE, BANKA

Guljari Yadav Versus State of Bihar

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 882 of 2026

Date of filing : 29.06.2026

Date of order : 20.08.2026

In the matter of :

*Guljari Yadav son of Sattan Yadav, age 30 years, resident of village Lalwamore,
p.s. Fullidumar, district Banka*

..... Petitioner

-Versus-

1. State of Bihar

*2. Pinki Devi wife of Guljari Yadav, age 23 years, resident of village
Lalwamore, p.s. Fullidumar, district Banka*

.....Opposite Party

*Present : - Petitioner in person along with his counsel Sri Sanjeev Kumar
 Choudhary, Advocate.
 Sri Hira Lal Singh, Public Prosecutor for the State,
 Complainant in person, along with her counsel Sri Kranti Kumar
 Jha, Advocate.*

ORDER

1. Apprehending arrest the petitioner has preferred this pre-arrest bail application who is booked in Complaint Case No. 40 of 2024, for the offence allegedly committed under Sections 498A and 494 of IPC.

2. The case of prosecution is engendered upon a complaint filed by one Pinki Devi with the allegations that her marriage was solemnized with accused no. 1, Guljari Yadav. Soon after the marriage the victim was subjected to cruelty by all accused persons for rupees one lakh and a motorcycle. Ultimately, she was ousted of the house in the night. Now, she came to know that her husband has solemnized his second marriage with Sabita Kumari. The parents of Sabita Kumari i.e. Baikunth Yadav and Geeta Devi also threatened her to kill in case she went to the house of accused persons.

3. Notice was issued to the complainant, who appeared in person. On the other hand, the petitioner also appeared in the court. The petitioner on his appearance himself admitted that he has solemnized his second marriage with Sabita Kumari daughter of Baikunth Yadav, resident of village Goda, PS Banka, District Banka, only after four months of his marriage with the complainant Pinki Devi.

IN THE COURT OF SATYA BHUSHAN ARYA, SESSIONS JUDGE, BANKA

Guljari Yadav Versus State of Bihar

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 882 of 2026

Date of filing : 29.06.2026

Date of order : 20.08.2026

4. *In oral arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it is a complaint case, therefore pre-arrest bail may be allowed.*

5. *Learned counsel for the complainant stoutly opposed the bail application on the ground that this case is of the year 2024 and the learned trial court has only issuedailable warrant and in order to avoid his appearance in the court and to harass the complainant the accused/petitioner has filed this pre-arrest bail application, whereas the police has no role of any kind in this case.*

6. *Heard rival submissions and perused the record. In this case, the petitioner himself has admitted that he has solemnized his second marriage just after four months of his marriage with the complainant Pinki Devi. Further, the case is of the year 2024 and the learned trial court has issued summons and when the accused did not appear,ailable warrant was issued. Therefore, in the opinion of this court, the petitioner is not entitled for the pre-arrest bail; resultantly, it is dismissed.*

7. *A copy of this order be sent to the learned trial court for information and the record be consigned to record room.*

8. *Keeping in view the General Order no. 1 of 1991 (Criminal) dated 07.03.1991, the certified copy of FIR, if desired, be returned back to the petitioner on placing the xerox copy thereof on record.*

(Dictated)

(Satya Bhushan Arya)
Sessions Judge, Banka