

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39669 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1387 Year-2017 Thana- BHABHU(KAIMUR) COMPLAIN C
District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

=====

RAMANAND GUPTA SON OF SHIV MURAT SAH RESIDENT OF
VILLAGE - AKODHI MELA, P.S. - DURGAWATI, DISTRICT - KAIMUR
AT BHABHUA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR
2. SUNITA DEVI WIFE OF RAMANAND GUPTA RESIDENT OF
VILLAGE - AKODHI MELA, P.S. - DURGAWATI, DISTRICT - KAIMUR
AT BHABHUA, AT PRESENT RESIDE WITH FATHER NAMELY
RAMLAL SAH, RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - BELAHRI, P.O. - KHAS
BAMHAUR, P.S. - MOHANIA, DISTRICT - KAIMUR AT BHABUA

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Tribhuwan Narayan, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 18-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of

the complainant.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this
is the second attempt of the petitioner to seek anticipatory bail.
It is further submitted that the dispute is matrimonial. It is next
submitted that petitioner had earlier moved this Court seeking



anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No. 67654 of 2021 and the same was rejected by an order dated 11.10.2022. Thereafter, on 18.05.2024, the petitioner filed the instant anticipatory bail application on the ground that the dispute is matrimonial and petitioner is paying the monthly maintenance on which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that petitioner from 2019 till date has paid an amount of Rs.2,25,000/- on which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has paid an amount of Rs.2,40,000/-.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that petitioner till date has to pay an amount of Rs.3,70,000/- out of which even presuming what has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner to be true without admitting, the petitioner has paid only an amount of Rs.2,40,000/-. It is further submitted that out of the wedlock, two daughters were born, who presently are staying with the complainant, as such, one can well imagine the plight of the complainant and the two daughters that how they must be sustaining themselves in absence of any financial support from the petitioner. It is next submitted that on the earlier occasion also when petitioner had moved this Court



seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No. 67654 of 2021, this Court after recording a detailed order had rejected the anticipatory bail.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to entertain the second anticipatory bail application.

6. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected in connection with Bhabua (Kaimur) Complaint Case No. 1387 of 2017 pending in the Court of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Kaimur at Bhabua/Successor Court.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

