

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52624 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-706 Year-2014 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-  
Rohtas

=====

SURENDRA RAM Son of Shiv Poojan Ram Resident of village - Rakaba,  
P.S. - Chenari, Distt. - Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR Bihar
2. Renu Kumari Wife of Surendra Ram Resident of village - Rakaba, P.S. -  
Chenari, Distt. - Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                             |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr.Rajendra Kumar Deo, Adv. |
| For the O.P. No. 2       | : | Mr. Rameshwar Singh, Adv.   |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Umanath Mishra, APP     |

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

5      11-03-2024                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
  
counsel for the Complainant as well as learned Additional  
  
Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case in  
connection with Complaint Case No. 706 of 2014 dated  
30.06.2014 registered for the offence/s punishable u/ss 323 and  
498A of the Indian Penal Code and <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of the DP Act.

3. 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 a  
motorcycle as dowry.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner is the husband of the complainant. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the complainant. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. The marriage was solemnized between the parties in 2007. Learned counsel for 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 at para 3 of the bail petition.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant as well as learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances



of the case as well as the allegation being general and omnibus, let the above named petitioner, in the event of his arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be enlarged on 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, Sasaram, Rohtas in connection with Complaint Case No. 706 of 2014, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, with further condition/s:-

(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)**

guddukr/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

