

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49972 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1161 Year-2020 Thana- SAMASTIPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Samastipur

=====

Dhananjay Paswan @ Dhananjay Kumar Paswan Son Of Ganesh Paswan R/O
Village- Bhagwanpur, Ps -BHAGWANPUR, Distt- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Indu Kumari Wife of Dhananjay Paswan Daughter of Late Dashrath Ram
R/O Village- Bhagwanpur, PS -Bhagwanpur, Distt- Begusarai Present
Address Village- Barah Pathar, Ps- Town, Distt- Samastipur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bijay Bhushan Prasad, Advocate.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Md. Iftekhar Mahmood, A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Madhav Kumar, Advocate.

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

4 29-01-2024 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 Complaint Case No. 1161 of 2020, Tr. No.

2694 of 2022 registered for the offence punishable under

Sections 498A of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 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 complainant mentally and physically due to non-fulfillment of demand of Rs. 2 lakh as dowry.

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 who is the husband of the complainant. It is further submitted that the petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the complainant. 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, Samastipur in connection with Complaint Case No. 1161 of 2020, Tr. No. 2694 of 2022, 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.

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	
---	--	---	--

