

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43886 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-461 Year-2020 Thana- VAISALI COMPLAINT CASE District-
Vaishali

=====

SUBASH THAKUR @ SONU Son of Naresh Thakur Resident of village -
Sastoul, P.s. - Tishiotta, Distt. - Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR
2. Sarita Kumari Wife of Subash Thakur @ Sonu Resident of village - Sastol,
P.s. - Tishiotta, Distt. - Vaishali, at present residing at D/o Upendra Thakur,
R/v Damodarpur, P.s. - Sarai, Distt. - Vaishali

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sabal Kumar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs.Veena Kumari Jaiswal

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

5 17-02-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No. 461 of 2020, for the
offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 406, 379, 323, 504,
506, 307, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner and the
other co-accused persons are alleged to have tortured the
complainant due to non-fulfillment of demand of a chain and a
motorcycle as dowry.

4. 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 is the husband of the complainant. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the complainant. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel further submits that a Civil Miscellaneous Case No. 358/2020 against the order of Matrimonial (Div.) Case No. 474/2018 was dismissed vide order dated 07.07.2022. 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 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.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the allegation being general and omnibus against the petitioner, 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, Vaishali, Hajipur in connection with Complaint Case No. 461 of 2020, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, with further condition:-

(i) The petitioner is directed to remain physically present before the learned court below on each and every date, failing which on two consecutive dates without reasonable cause, the bail bond of the petitioner is liable to be cancelled.

7. 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.

8. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

