

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9634 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-380 Year-2024 Thana- DARBHANGA COMPLAINT CASE
District- Darbhanga

=====

Guddu Sahni, Son of Bhagirath Sahni, Resident of Village- Mohanpur Police
Station -Sadar District -Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Subha Devi Daughter of Ramwali Sahni village- Akaraha, Ps- Ashok paper
Mill, Dist- Darbhanga, Wife of Guddu Sahni Village- Mohanpur, Ps- Sadar,
Dist- Darbhanga

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Rahul Kumar Dubey, Advocate. Mr. Nilendu Kumar Choudhary, Advocate.
For the State	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar Pandey, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 06-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail, apprehending his arrest,
in connection with Complaint Case No. 380 of 2024, dated
28.3.2024 filed for the offences punishable under Sections 341,
323, 326, 307, 498(A), 504, 494, 506 of the Indian Penal Code
and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, but cognizance has
been taken against the petitioner for the offences punishable
under Sections 498(A), 323 of the Indian Penal Code and
Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per allegation, after marriage, there was demand



of additional dowry of Rs.2,00,000/- and on account of non-fulfillment of the same, the Complainant/wife was subjected to beating. There is also allegation that the petitioner/husband has remarried with another lady.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that there is no truth in the allegation of demand of dowry or any remarriage with another lady and only on account of misconception of the complainant/wife, the marriage is not working and this false case has been filed.

5. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one in the instant case.

6. It has further been stated in paragraph no.3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

7. However, learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the Petitioner for bail.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, **this petition is allowed**, directing the petitioner, above-named, to be enlarged on bail, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt / production of a copy of this order, on his



furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000 /- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Darbhanga, in connection with Complaint Case No. 380 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) Cr.PC and on the following conditions:

(i) In case, it is brought to the notice of the court below that the petitioner has any criminal antecedents, learned court below shall cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner after hearing him and getting satisfied that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents despite his knowledge of the same.

(ii) In case, it is brought to the notice of the court below that statement regarding previous bail petition is wrong, learned court below shall cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

S.Ali/-

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

