

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13520 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1894 Year-2016 Thana- SAMASTIPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Samastipur

=====

Umesh Roy Son of Ramsagar Roy R/O Vill.- Chakosan, P.S.- Bidupur, Dist.-
Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Geeta Devi W/O Umesh Roy R/O Vill.- Chakosan, P.S.- Bidupur, Dist.-
Vaishali. At Present R/O Vill.- Chakpahar, P.S.- Tajpur, Dist.- Samastipur.
... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Md. Hussamuddin Azad, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.J.N. Thakur, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

4 23-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Samastipur Complaint Case No. 1894 of 2016, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code
and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. According to allegation, the petitioner who is husband
of the complainant committed atrocities on the victim and ultimately,
he ousted her from the matrimonial house.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that
the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case.
The petitioner is ready to keep the complainant with full dignity and
honour, but she is not willing to reside with the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant



has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the petitioner has solemnized his second marriage and the complainant is passing miserable days in financial scarcity along with her daughter. He further submitted that the Principal Judge, Family Court, Samastipur, vide order dated 06.08.2019, granted maintenance of Rs. 5,000/- per month to the complainant, in a proceeding under Section 125 of the CrPC, but the petitioner neither challenged that order nor paid a single rupee to the complainant. He has also submitted that process under Section 82 of the CrPC has been issued, as such, the petitioner is not entitled to the privileges of anticipatory bail.

6. In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail, which is hereby *rejected*.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/-

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

