

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.60510 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -1003 Year- 2016 Thana -ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
SASARAM (ROHTAS)

=====

Dhananjay Kumar S/o Bijendra Sah, R/o Vill./Mohalla- Ward No. 2, Shastri Nagar, Near Kaili Road, Dayabir Baba, Chandauli P.O. and P.S. - Chandauli, District- Chandauli, (U.P.), presently R/o Dhananjay Boys Suppliers, Chauhan Compound, Shiv Shiva Society, Sanjay Nagar, Lalji Para, Kandivali (West), P.S.- Kandiwali, Mumbai-400067.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Kumari Kasmira @ Patigya W/o Dhananjay Kumar, D/o Dasarath Sah, R/o Vill.- Singuti, P.S.- Darigaon, P.O.- Sikriya, District- Rohtas.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Prem Kumar Jha, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-10-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 1003 of 2016 in which cognizance has been taken for the offences punishable under Section 498-A of the Indian Penal Code and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

Petitioner happens to be husband of the complainant (opposite party no. 2) and his marriage was solemnized with complainant on 17.05.2013. There is allegation of illegal demand as well as torturing against the petitioner but the impugned order



goes to show that complainant and petitioner entered into compromise before the court below and accordingly, complainant went along with the petitioner. However, subsequently the father of complainant filed a petition before S.D.J.M., Rohtas at Sasaram mentioning therein that he got telephonic message from complainant about the torturing at the hands of the petitioner and, thereafter, on the direction of S.D.J.M., Rohtas at Sasaram, petitioner along with complainant appeared before the above stated court and thereafter, complainant went along with her father.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as a matter of fact, complainant, herself, does not want to lead her conjugal life with the petitioner and that is the reason, she went along with her father.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances as well as submissions of the parties, this anticipatory bail petition is allowed and it is ordered that petitioner, in the event of his arrest/surrender within four weeks from the date of receipt of this order to the court concerned, shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram in Complaint



Case No. 1003 of 2016 subject to conditions as laid down under
Section 438(2) of the Cr. P. C.

(Hemant Kumar Srivastava, J)

SHAHZAD/- Rajeev

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

