

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38313 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-482 Year-2019 Thana- EAST CHAMPARAN COMPLAINT
District- East Champaran

=====

Md. Sikandar Azam @ Md. Sikander @ Bablu S/O Md. Gulam Kibaria @
Gulam Kibaria Masta R/O Village- Ward No.-16, Ataulahpur, P.S- Lalganj,
Dist.- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sitara Khatoon W/O Md. Sikiandar Azam @ Bablu, D/O Md. Rustam R/O
Village- Bhawanipur Zirat, Ward No. 21, P.S- Chatauni, Distt.- East
Champarna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Soni, Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Anita Kumari, APP
For O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Pramod Kumar Prasad, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 13-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP

for the State as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of

O.P. No.2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case

registered for the offences punishable under Section 498A of the

Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition

Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that

petitioner being husband has been falsely implicated in the

instant case by the complainant. It is next submitted that

relationship in between the petitioner and the O.P. No.2 has



deteriorated to an extent where it is not possible to revive the conjugal relationship but then with passage of time and on intervention of well wishers, the parties may resolve their dispute amicably. It is also submitted that petitioner in compliance of the order passed by the learned Family Court is paying the maintenance amount regularly and the arrears have also been cleared. It is also asserted and submitted that there will be no delay in making the payment of maintenance as decided by the learned Family Court.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of O.P. No.2 does not oppose the said submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that he is paying the maintenance regularly and the arrears have been cleared but then submits that it took petitioner three years for clearing the arrears of maintenance which was directed to be paid from the date of filing of the maintenance case, though petitioner was paying the maintenance as fixed from the date of the order regularly. It is also submitted that since petitioner is paying the maintenance, as such, no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner to jail.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, let petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender



before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Complaint Case No.482 of 2019, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sanjay/-

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

