

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6671 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-693 Year-2021 Thana- BEGUSARAI COMPLAINT CASE
District- Begusarai

=====

Aditya Kumar @ Satyam Kumar Son Of Ram Babu Rai R/O Village-
Barauni, Shokhara- 2, Dairy Road, P.S.- Barauni, District – Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Soni Kumari Daughter Of Umesh Singh R/O Village- Ramdiri, Tola Ram
Nagar, Ward No.-04, P.S.- Matihani, District- Begusarai.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bipin Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Priya Sharan Singh, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 30-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

counsel for the informant as well as learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

Let the defects, as pointed out by the office, be

removed within a period of four weeks from today.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case

registered for the offences punishable under Section 120(B),

498(A), 323, 504, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4

Dowry Prohibition Act.

Petitioner, who is husband of the complainant is said

to have ousted the complainant from her matrimonial home in

association of her family member over the dowry demand.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner is the husband of complainant and allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated.

Vide order dated 24.08.2022 the matter was referred to the Patna High Court Mediation and Reconciliation Centre for settle the dispute between the parties. Report reveals that the opposite party no.2 is not interested in mediation so compromise between the parties had not taken place and mediation was failed.

The learned counsel for the informant as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Complaint Case No. 693 of 2021, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. and also the following conditions:-



1. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

2. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

3. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

mdrashid/-

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

