

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74032 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-3531 Year-2023 Thana- SARAN COMPLAINT CASE District-  
Saran

=====

Sunil Rai @ Sunil Kumar Rai S/o Jamadar Rai R/o Village- Sutihar Pirari,  
P.S.- Derni, District- Chapra (Saran)

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Anjali Devi W/o Sunil Rai, D/o Chandrama Rai At Present Resident of  
Village- Jamuna, P.S.- Chapra Muffasil, District- Chapra (Saran)

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

**Appearance :**

|                        |   |                                                                |
|------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner     | : | Mr. Prasoon Shekhar, Advocate<br>Mr. Shyamal Prakash, Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party | : | Mr. Md. Iftekhar Mahmood, APP                                  |

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2      23-10-2024                      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. 3531/2023, Trial No. 883/2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 323, 504, 506 and 498A read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 & 4 of the D.P. 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 Rs. 2 lacs 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 who is husband of the complainant. 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.

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

6. 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, Saran at Chapra in connection with Complaint Case No. 3531/2023, Trial No. 883/2024, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

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)**

atul/-

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

