

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77045 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-25 Year-2023 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Araria

Mujahid Ashraf @ M. Mujahid Ashraf S/O Late Hasan Saleh R/O R- 874/A,
2nd Floor, Gali No. 7, Zakir Nagar, P.S.- Zakir Nagar , New Delhi-110025.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Adeeba Anjum W/O Mujahid Ashraf, D/O Samidur Rahman R/O Village-
Azad Nagar, Ward No. 20, P.S- Araria, Distt.- Araria.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Thakur Brajesh Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pradeep Narain Kumar, A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

2 19-12-2023 Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to

remove the defect(s), as pointed out by the office, if any,

within a period of three weeks from today.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Araria Mahila P.S. Case No. 25 of 2023
dated 06.07.2023 registered for the offence punishable
under Sections 341, 323, 498A, 379, 307, 504, 506 read
with 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 & 4 of the
D.P. Act.



4. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner and the co-accused persons are alleged to have tortured the informant mentally and physically due to non-fulfillment of demand of Rs. 50 lacs as dowry. It is further alleged that accused persons have ousted the informant from the matrimonial house by snatching all her belongings.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the informant. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is the husband of the informant and has no concern with the alleged offence. It is further submitted that the reconciliation was made between the parties but failed. It is further submitted that there is a delay of one month in lodging the F.I.R. The petitioner has relied upon the judgment of this Court in the case of "**Md. Naimul Haque Ansari @ Naimul Haque Ansari & Ors. Vs. The State of Bihar, reported in 2006(3) PLJR 182.**" Learned counsel has further submitted that Section 498A of the IPC is triable



by the Magistrate. Learned counsel has further relied on the judgments in the case of **Satendra Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another (2022) 10 SCR 351** and **Md. Asfak Alam Vs. The State of Jharkhand & Anr passed in Criminal Appeal No(s). 2207 of 2023 arising out of Special Leave Petition (CRL.) No. 3433 of 2023**. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, let the above named petitioner, in the event of his arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be enlarged on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees twenty thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court concerned, Araria in connection with Araria Mahila P.S. Case No. 25 of 2023, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

8. If so advised, either of the parties will be at



liberty to make an application before the Court below for referring the matter to the District Mediation Centre for the purpose of reconciliation or one time settlement.

9. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Nilmani/-

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

