IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 4510 of 2026

Sonu Kumar Paswan, age about 25 years, son of Anil Paswan, resident of village – Digwar, PO – Patranga, PS – Daru, District – Hazaribag, Jharkhand **.... Petitioner**

-- Versus --

The State of Jharkhand **.... Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner :- Mr. Santosh Kumar Soni, Advocate
For the State :- Mrs. Bandana Sinha, Advocate

---

*06/**11.09.2026*** Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as the learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Lohsinghna P.S. Case No.124 of 2025 for the alleged offences registered under Sections 85, 88, 89, 115(2), 303(2), 316(2), 318(2), 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 3 and 4 of D.P. Act pending in the Court of learned A.C.J.M., Hazaribag.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and the informant were residing in live-in-relationship. He further submits that no marriage was solemnized with the informant. He then submits that allegation of pregnancy and termination is also not correct against the petitioner. He next submits that the petitioner is neither the husband nor relative of the husband and in view of that dowry prohibition act is not attracted. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer and

submits that witnesses in the case diary have supported the case and even they have stated that the marriage between the petitioner and informant was solemnized in temple and in view of that anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. It is admitted by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in the course of argument that the petitioner and the informant were live-in-relationship. In the FIR, it has been alleged that on instigation of the petitioner the informant has taken Rs.3 lacs from Mahila Samiti as a loan and after taking the said amount the petitioner has left the informant. In paragraph No.6 of the case diary, witness Rekha Rani has stated that the informant was residing along with the petitioner since last three-four years and the marriage of the informant along with this petitioner was solemnized on 10.06.2022 in Budhwa Mahadev Temple in Hazaribagh and the same line has been repeated by the witness Deepa Devi in paragraph No.7 of the case diary as well as Sumitra Devi in paragraph No.8 of the case diary and further in paragraph No.9 of the case diary by Vinay Kumar Paswan. It has come in paragraph No.60 of the case diary that the petitioner is absconding and not cooperating in the trial.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances of this case, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated 11.09.2026
Sangam/