

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38120 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-204 Year-2022 Thana- DARBHANGA COMPLAINT CASE
District- Darbhanga

=====

Ravi Kumar S/o Shyam Babu Yadav R/o Village- Fardahi Tol, Jaynagar, P.S.-
Jaynagar, District- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Soni Kumari W/o Ravi Kumar D/o Late Ramchandra Yadav, R/o Mohalla-
Aazamnagar, Teacher Colony, P.S.- L.N.M.U., District- Darbhanga

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Girish Chandra Jha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

3 09-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Rabindra Kumar

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 324,
498A, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with
Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
notice in terms of the order dated 19.06.2025 was filed in time.
It is next submitted that from perusal of the office report dated
11.08.2025, it would manifest that the same records- service
report of ordinary notice has been returned unserved stating by
Process Server that notice has been returned due to address not



confirmed, kept at Flag- 'S', thereafter, it records that A/D with registered cover notice has been returned stating by postal peon that address is incomplete, which is kept at Flag- 'A'.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner draws the attention of the Court to Flag- 'A' to submit that the address recorded on the notice is Soni Kumari w/o Ravi Kumar, D/o Late Ram Chandra Yadav, resident of Mohalla-Aazamgarh, Teacher's Colony, P.S.- LNMU District-Darbhangha. It is submitted that from perusal of the Complaint Case No. 204 of 2022, it would manifest that the address as recorded on the notice is the same as stated by the O.P. No. 2 in the aforesaid complaint case.

5. The Court has compared the address written on the notice and the address furnished by the O.P. No. 2 in the complaint petition and both are same, as such, it appears that the O.P. No. 2 deliberately is not interested in receiving the notice.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner, being husband, has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the O.P. No. 2. It is next submitted that a specific pleading has been made at Para-7 to the anticipatory bail application that petitioner is willing to keep the O.P. No. 2 with full dignity and honour. It is also submitted that from perusal of



the allegation as alleged in the complaint, it would manifest that the allegation of torture and demand of dowry is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that may be with passage of time and on intervention of well wishers, the parties may resolve their dispute. It is also submitted that petitioner, being husband, is aware of his responsibility towards his wife. It is next submitted that he has instruction to make submission that petitioner works as a labourer in a shop and earns about Rs. 9,000-10,000/- per month. It is further submitted that petitioner, being husband, is aware of his responsibility and will pay an amount of Rs. 3,000/- by way of maintenance to the O.P. No. 2 which shall commence from 01.10.2025.

7. Learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Rabindra Kumar, though opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, but then fairly submits that the dispute is matrimonial and since it has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that in future, on intervention of well wishers, the dispute may get resolved, as such, no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner to jail when he is ready to pay a monthly maintenance of Rs. 3,000/- to the O.P. No. 2.

8. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the 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 bonds 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. 204 of 2022 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

9. However, it is made clear that the O.P. No. 2 shall be at liberty to file an application before this Court seeking cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner in the event if the petitioner does not deposit the amount of monthly maintenance, as agreed, for two consecutive months.

10. Let a copy of this order be sent to the learned Trial Court for being handed over to the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the O.P. No. 2 herein.

11. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

