

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32956 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1609 Year-2014 Thana- SAHARSA COMPLAINT CASE Dis-
trict- Saharsa

=====

Dilip Kumar @ Pradip Kumar @ Dalip Kumr @ Pradip Kumar Dalip Kumar
Son of Late Nago Bhagat @ Nageshwar Bhagat Resident of Village - Khaju-
raha, P.S.- Sonbarsa Raj, District - Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Khusbu Devi Wife of Dilip Kumar Resident of village - Khajuraha, P.S.-
Sonbarsa, District - Saharsa at present Khushbu Devi Daughter of Anil Bha-
gat Resident of village - Purani Bazar Simri Bakhtiyarpur P.S. and P.O.-
Simri Bakhtiyarpur, Distt.- Saharsa.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Amarnath Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Akbar Ali, APP
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Abhas Chandra, Advocate

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

4 11-11-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Complaint Case No. 1609C/2014, registered for the
offences punishable under Section 498A of the Indian Penal
Code and u/s 3/4 of the D.P. Act.

3. According to allegation, the complainant is the wife
of the petitioner. Her marriage was solemnized with the
petitioner on 20.01.2012. The petitioner brought his wife at the
place of his working in Himachal Pradesh and from where he
demanded Rs. 1 Lakh from father of the complainant. Due to
non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, the petitioner and his
family members inflicted atrocities and she was passing her



miserable days in her parental house in financial scarcity.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He never demanded dowry. As a matter of fact, the complainant herself is not willing to reside with the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the complainant have opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that since the complainant was in financial scarcity she filed a case for maintenance and the petitioner didn't appear in that case and ex-parte order of maintenance was passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Saharsa vide order dated 27.07.2021 whereby the learned Principal Judge, Saharsa granted a monthly maintenance of Rs. 3,000/- for the complainant and Rs. 1,000/-each for both of her children but the petitioner is still evading that order and the distress warrant has been issued against him.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner doesn't deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

