

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13972 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-78 Year-2024 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Bhojpur

Ranjit Ram Son of Late Hasbansh Ram Resident of Village - Padariya, P.S. -
Tarari, District - Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Manisha Kumari Wife of Ranjit Ram, Daughter of Ramu Ram Resident of
Village - Padariya, P.S. - Tarari, District - Bhojpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Anil Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Abhay Kumar
	Mr. Raju Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf
of the OP No. 2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323,
504, 506, 498A, 313 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3
and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the
informant. It is next submitted that even marriage is disputed,
but then it is fairly submitted that the same can only be tested in
a duly constituted trial. It is also submitted that since OP No. 2



is claiming to be the wife of the petitioner, as such petitioner for the present is willing to pay monthly maintenance of Rs.6,000/- (Six Thousand), which shall commence from 1-6-2025.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the OP No. 2 vehemently rebuts the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that marriage is disputed. It is further submitted that the marriage of the informant with the petitioner was performed in accordance with Hindu rituals and out of the wedlock, a child was also born, who presently is 4 months old and is staying with the informant.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, at this stage, submits that the case has also been instituted under Section 313 of the IPC in order to give a serious color to the case.

6. On query from the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the OP No. 2 that who was the Doctor, who carried out the abortion, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the OP No. 2 is not in a position to furnish his reply, but then submits that since petitioner is willing to pay a monthly maintenance of Rs. 6,000/-, as such no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner to jail and chances of future reconciliation will also get marred.



7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Mahila (Bhojpur) P.S. Case No. 78 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

8. However, it is made clear that OP No. 2 shall be at liberty to file an application before this court seeking cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner, in the event if the petitioner does not deposit the monthly maintenance as agreed for two consecutive months.

9. It is further made clear that the present maintenance shall stop, if a court of competent jurisdiction fixes the maintenance.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

