

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6068 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-607 Year-2019 Thana- SAHARSA COMPLAINT CASE  
District- Saharsa

=====

Bhavesh Kumar Yadav @ Pappu @ Bhawesh Kumar Yadav Son of Lalo  
Yadav, Resident of Village - Rasalpur, P.S.- Nauhatta, District- Saharsa, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rinku Devi Wife of Bhavesh Kumar Yadav @ Pappu, D/O- Dinesh Yadav  
Resident of Vill- Kahara, P.S.- Sadar, District- Saharsa, Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                    |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Kuldeep Kumar, Advocate        |
| For the O.P. No. 2   | : | Mr. Satish Kumar Singh, Advocate   |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Anil Kumar Singh No. 1, A.P.P. |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      14-02-2025                      Heard Mr. Kuldeep Kumar learned counsel  
  
appearing on behalf of the petitioner; Mr. Satish Kumar Singh,  
  
learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no. 2  
  
and Mr. Anil Kumar Singh No. 1, learned APP for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with  
  
Complaint Case No. 607 of 2019 registered for offences  
  
punishable under Sections 323, 498(A) and 504 of the Indian  
  
Penal Code.

3. As per the allegation made in the complaint, due to  
  
non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, the petitioner and  
  
hisfamily members committed cruelty and tortured the  
  
complainant and thereafter they forcibly ousted her from her



matrimonial house.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that he has received instruction that petitioner is ready to live along with the opposite party no. 2 and in this regard, he has made a specific statement in paragraph no. 11 of the bail application. He further submitted that petitioner petitioner is willing to file restitution petition before the Family Court having jurisdiction.

5. Mr. Satish Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 along with learned A.P.P., for the State have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the fact that petitioner is ready to reconcile with the opposite party no. 2 and he is also willing to file restitution petition before the Family Court having jurisdiction, the learned District Court is directed to release the petitioner, above named, on bail upon furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Judicial Magistrate - 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Saharsa, in connection with Complaint Case No. 607 of 2019 subject to the following conditions:

(i) Bailors should be local having sufficient



immovable property within the jurisdiction of the Court concerned.

(ii) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court.

(iii) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses of the case, in that case, prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

(iv) If the petitioner is found involved in similar nature of offence, after his release on bail, the trial Court shall take steps to cancel his bail bond.

**(v) The learned District Court is directed to verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail application. If any other case is pending against the petitioner as what has been stated in paragraph no. 3, this order will lose its force automatically.**

**(Purnendu Singh, J)**

Niraj/-

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

