

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9627 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-214 Year-2022 Thana- JEHANABAD COMPLAINT CASE
District- Jehanabad

=====

Pintu Kumar S/o- Naresh Prasad Gupta Village- Kursisarai Po- Samaspur Ps-
Belaganj Dist- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pritish Kumar Lal, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Kumar Ranjit Ranjan, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 06-03-2025 Learned counsel for the petitioner is seeking permission to delete the name of Opposite Party No.2/Sarita Kumari from the array of the Opposite Party because inadvertently, she has been made Opposite Party as there is no legal requirement to implead the informant/complainant in the petition.

2. permission is accorded.

3. Accordingly, the name of Opposite Party No. 2 is deleted from the array of the Opposite Party.

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

5. The petitioner seeks bail, apprehending his arrest, in connection with Complaint Case No. 214-C of 2022, dated



14.07.2022 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 379, 504, 498A/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

6. As per allegation, subsequent to marriage, the complainant/wife joined the matrimonial house of the petitioner/husband, but there was demand of additional dowry of Rs.2,00,000/- and in case of non-fulfillment of the same, she was threatened that the petitioner/husband would marry with another lady. It is further alleged that petitioner has also threatened to beat her.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that as per alleged facts and circumstances, no offence is made out under Section 498-A of the Indian Penal Code and there is no physical violence against the petitioner. He further submits that as a matter of fact, the petitioner/husband is a labourer working in Ahmadabad and he is not able to keep his wife along with him at the place of working whereas she is insisting that she should be kept with him. Hence, a false case has been lodged only to harass the petitioner.

8. 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.

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

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

11. 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, Arwal, in connection with Complaint Case No. 214-C of 2022, 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	
---	--	---	--

