

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35467 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-310 Year-2019 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Jamui

Amit Soren @ Amit Shoren, Son of Sidhunandan Soren, R/o village-
Genuadih, P.S.- Chandramandih, Dist- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sarita Devi, Wife of Amit Soren @ Amit Shoren, R/o village- Genuadih,
P.S.- Chandramandih, Dist- Jamui, At present Father Karu Marandi P.S.-
Kaduwatari, P.S- Barahat, Dist- Jamui.

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Tarkeshwar Nath Thakur, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 18-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail, apprehending his arrest,
in connection with Complaint Case No.310C of 2019, registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A) of the Indian
Penal Code and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per allegation, soon after the marriage, illegal
demand for dowry started and on account of non-fulfillment of
the same the complainant/wife was subjected to cruelty by the
Petitioner and his family members.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
Petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this
case. As a matter of fact on account of normal wear and tear of
married life, the Complaint/Wife is aggrieved and she has filed a



false case. There is no truth in her allegation of torturing by the Petitioner which is proved by the statement of the complainant in her statement under solemn affirmation before learned Magistrate wherein, she has stated that she wants to go to her Sasural (Matrimonial Home). Had there been any torturing, she might not be willing to go to her Sasural (Matrimonial Home). He further submits that the petitioner is also willing to keep his wife in his matrimonial home with all love and dignity. He also submits that the maximum punishment prescribed for the alleged offence is three years.

5. 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.

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

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

8. 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 concerned Court Below, in connection with Complaint Case No.310C of 2019, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the B.N.S.S., 2023 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.

9. However, the Complaint/Wife is at liberty to go to her matrimonial home with the petitioner/husband and if she is not taken by him, she is at liberty to move Family Court for matrimonial relief.

(Jitendra Kumar, J.)

Chandan/-

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

