

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13576 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-380 Year-2024 Thana- MASAUDHI District- Patna

Ranjit Kumar, Son of Bimal Yadav, Village -Tineri Math, P.S. -Masaurhi,
Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Juli Kumari, D/O Raju Prasad R/O Vill-Murgiyachak, P.S.-Hilsa, Distt-
Nalanda

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dharendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate Mr. Amrit Lal, Advocate Ms. Soni Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

6 16-12-2025 Earlier notices were issued to the wife of the petitioner, who was added as opposite party no.2. It seems that the ordinary notice was received by the mother of the opposite party no.2 and a jointness affidavit has also been filed on behalf of the petitioner stating that the opposite party no.2 has been residing with her parents. The notice was earlier accepted to be validly served vide order dated 01.12.2025. Despite valid service of notice, nobody appears on behalf of the opposite party no.2.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

3. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with



Masaurhi P.S. Case No. 380 of 2024 dated 16.05.2024 registered for the offences under Sections 498(A), 365, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

4. As per the prosecution case, the informant has alleged that his daughter was married to the petitioner around three years ago and the in-laws started demanding Rs.1,00,000/- as dowry and consequently on 10.05.2024 the petitioner is stated to have called the informant i.e. the father of the wife of the petitioner and stated that his wife (daughter of the informant) had fled away and she is traceless.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present case has been filed on false and concocted story of demand of dowry, however, it is the wife of the petitioner, who was in a love affair with a boy prior to the marriage with whom she has left the house of the petitioner out of her own sweet will and has been staying at Rajgir and working in a mall. It has been submitted that the allegations of demand of dowry or torture are all frivolous in order to cover the misdeeds of the wife of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner draws the attention of this Court towards the impugned order wherein the statement of the victim Juli Kumari recorded under Section 183 of BNSS is referred wherein she has stated that she was ousted from her



matrimonial house, however, she had gone to Rajgir and have got a job for her livelihood. It has been stated that the statement of the victim girl corroborates the stand of the petitioner that she has been living alone out of her own sweet will after fleeing away from the house of the petitioner. It has lastly been stated that the petitioner has clean antecedent.

6. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and stated that it was on account of torture for non-fulfillment of demand of dowry that the opposite party no.2 was thrown out of her house and she was compelled to live in Rajgir for her livelihood.

7. Considering the aforesaid submissions and taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case, let the petitioner above named be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/-(ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Masaurhi P.S. Case No. 380 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure read with corresponding Section 482(2) of B.N.S.S.



as well as subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his close relative.
- (ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.
- (iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates, or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.
- (iv) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail is allowed.

9. It is made clear that the observation, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/-

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

