

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77216 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-865 Year-2019 Thana- BUXAR COMPLAINT CASE District-
Buxar

=====

Ravindra Nath Pathak @ Rabindra Nath Pathak Son Of Late Ram Murty
Pathak R/O Of Village- Niyajipur, P.S.- Simari, District- Buxar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Bihar
2. Geeta Devi W/O Ravindra Nath Pathak @ Rabindra Nath Pathak R/O Of
Village- Niyajipur, P.S.- Simari, District- Buxar, D/O Dinanath Ojha At
Present Village- Ojha Ke Baraw, P.S.- Murar, District- Buxar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Ravi Shankar Pathak, Advocate
For the complainant	:	Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Shailendra Kumar, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 04-01-2024 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
counsel for the complainant as well as learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for the State.

3. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case in
connection with Complaint Case No. 865C of 2019 dated
17.08.2019 registered for the offence/s punishable u/s 498A of the
Indian Penal Code and ¾ of the DP 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. 15 lakh as dowry.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner is the husband of the complainant. The present case has been filed after nine years of marriage. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the complainant. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. 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.

6. 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.



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 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, Buxar in connection with Complaint Case No. 865C of 2019, 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)

guddukr/-

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

