

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40848 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-478 Year-2023 Thana- GAYA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Gaya

=====

Sudhir Kumar @ Sudhir Kumar Yadav Son of Ram Lakhan Yadav @ Ram
Lakhan Prasad Yadav Resident of Village - Adopur, P.S.- Aanti, District -
Gaya (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Smt. Sintu Kumari Wife of Sudhir Kumar @ Sudhir Kumar Yadav Resident
of Village - Adopur, Post - Angara, P.S.- Aanti, District - Gaya, Presently
Daughter of Suresh Prasad, Resident of Village - Jiri Tola Malahi, Post -
Dihuri, P.S.- Atri, District - Gaya (Bihar)

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Uma Kant Mishra, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Bishweshwar Ram, APP
For the OP no. 2	:	Mr. Vijay Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

4 08-10-2025

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for
grant of anticipatory bail apprehending his arrest in connection
with Complaint Case no. 478(C) of 2023 registered under
section 498A of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the opposite party no.
2 was married to the petitioner herein in the year 2016. It is
stated that soon thereafter, the accused persons including the



petitioner, who happens to be her husband, started to torture the complainant for non-fulfillment of the demands by way of Rs. 8 Lacs in cash for purchase of tractor etc. She was ultimately forced out of the house.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case only for the reason that he happens to be the husband of the complainant. In fact, the complainant was suffering from mental/psychological problem for which she had also been medically treated, which would be evident from the contents of the prescription brought on record. The allegations of assault, torture, etc are all false and concocted. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. The application for anticipatory bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the complainant. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that even on an earlier occasion, a complaint was filed against the petitioner in the year 2021. Though in the *Panchayati* held, the petitioner undertook to keep the complainant properly, the torture once again having started, has led to the instant complaint. It is further submitted that because of the conciliation between the parties on the false promise by the petitioner led to the earlier complaint being dismissed for non-prosecution.



6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegation against the petitioner in the complaint together with the submissions made, in the facts of the case, it is directed that the petitioner above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks, be released on anticipatory bail in connection with Complaint Case no. 478 of 2023 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 Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Gaya.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

saauravkrsinha/-

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

