

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18570 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-57 Year-2024 Thana- AMDABAD District- Katihar

Alamgir @ Mohammad Alamgir Son of Azizul Rahman village- Sukhasan
Durgapur, ps- Barari, dist- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sanwara Khatoon Daughter of Munsahak Village- Jiyamari, ps- Amdabad,
Dist- katihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mohammed Arif
For the Informant : Mr. Kunwar Ajit Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 4 13-08-2025 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.
2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out
of Amdabad Police Station Case No. 57 of 2024, dated
23.03.2024, disclosing offences under Sections 498(a)/34
of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry
Prohibition Act.
3. The prosecution case, as per the First Information Report,
is that the marriage of the petitioner was solemnized with
the informant on 03.03.2024. Just after the marriage, the
petitioner started demanding dowry and due to non-
fulfillment of demand of dowry, the informant was



tortured mentally and physically. It is further alleged that the signature of informant was forcibly taken by the petitioner on a blank paper. Finally, the informant was ousted from the matrimonial home.

4. The matter was referred to the mediation centre vide order, dated 14.05.2025, by this Court, however, the mediation failed.
5. Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is aged about 23 years, but he was forced to marry the informant/complainant, who is elder to the petitioner and at the time of marriage, she was aged about 29 years. He next submits that from Annexure-2, it appears that the informant has already divorced the petitioner by way of Kholanama before the Panches.
6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that Khulanama was prepared unilaterally by the petitioner after taking the signature of the informant forcibly. He next submits that the petitioner never approached for Khulanama.
7. Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the



parties and taking into consideration the fact that within one years of marriage there is demand of dowry and tortured to the informant, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.

8. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

ashwani/-

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

