

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20682 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-41 Year-2022 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - MANJHAUL
District- Begusarai

=====

Neeraj Sahni @ Niraj Sahni S/O Daharu Sahni R/O Manjhaul, Panchmukhi
Tola, P.S.- Cheriabariyarpur, Dist.- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Arti Kumari W/O Niraj Sahni @ Neeraj Sahni, D/O Ram Karan Sahni R/O
Manjhaul, Panchmukhi Tola, P.S.- Cheriabariyarpur, Dist.- Begusarai. R/O
Vill.- Meghaul, P.S.- Khodabandpur, Dist.- Begusarai.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Nakul Kumar Jamuar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Surendra Prasad Singh, APP
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Randhir Kumar No.1, Advocate

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 17-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the complainant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Complaint Case No. 41C/2022 instituted for the offences under
Sections 498A, 307, 379, 323, 341, 406, 504 of the Indian Penal
Code and Sections 3 / 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner
alongwith the family members tortured the complainant for the
non-fulfillment of demand of dowry and ousted her from her
matrimonial house.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the



petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. Petitioner is the husband of the complainant. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner. No specific overt act is alleged against the petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that complainant filed a complaint petition against the petitioner and other accused persons in which the cognizance was taken against the petitioner and others for the offences under Section 498A, 323, 504 of the IPC and Section 3/4 of the D.P. Act. Learned counsel further submitted that earlier, provisional bail of the petitioner was granted bail in B.A. No. 1267 of 2024 dated 10.11.2023 for two months by the learned Court below with certain condition but the petitioner could not fulfill that condition, therefore, his bond was cancelled on 25.09.2024 and the petitioner was taken into custody the same day. Learned counsel further submitted that petitioner is ready to keep his wife but, as a matter of fact, the wife/complainant does not want to live with the petitioner. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 25.09.2024 and has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail



to the petitioner

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as also the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Let the petitioner be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below/concerned Court in connection with Complaint Case No. 41C/2022, subject to the following conditions:

(I) The petitioner shall appear on each and every date fixed at the trial. In case of default in such appearance on two consecutive dates, the Trial Court will have liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(II) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or gives the threat to the complainant or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

