

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47980 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-678 Year-2024 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
Rohtas

=====

Chitranjan Sharma S/o Late Birendra Sharma, R/o Vill - Bihari Bigaha, P.S.-
Akorhi Gola, Distt.- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Tetari Kumari W/o Chitranjan Sharma, D/o Satya Narayan Sharma R/o vill -
Chintawanpur, P.S.- Sasaram (M), Distt.- Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dhaneshwar Prasad Gupta, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Surendra Prasad Singh, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

3 03-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

counsel for the informant/complainant and the learned A.P.P. for

the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case

in connection with Complaint Case No. 678 of 2024, registered for

the offence punishable under Section 498A of the Indian Penal

Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner and co-

accused persons are alleged to have tortured the complainant

mentally and physically due to non-fulfillment of demand of Rs. 5

lakhs as dowry and ousted her from her matrimonial home.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted



that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the complainant. The allegation levelled in the complaint petition is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any such offence as alleged in the complaint petition. It is further submitted that the petitioner is the husband of the complainant and he has no concern with the alleged offence and he is ready to keep the complainant with full honour and dignity. The petitioner has relied upon the judgment of this Court in the case of ***“Md. Naimul Haque Ansari @ Naimul Haque Ansari & Ors. Vs. The State of Bihar, reported in 2006(3) PLJR 182.”*** Learned counsel has further submitted that Section 498 A of the the Indian Penal Code is triable by the Magistrate. Learned counsel has further relied on the judgments in the case of ***Satendra Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another (2022) 10 SCR 351*** and ***Md. Asfak Alam Vs. The State of Jharkhand & Another*** passed in **Criminal Appeal No (s). 2207 of 2023** arising out of **Special Leave Petition (CRL.) No. 3433 of 2023**. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent as stated at para 3 of the bail petition.

5. Learned counsel for the informant/complainant as well as learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances



as well as the nature of allegation against the petitioner, let the petitioner named-above, in the event of his arrest / surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be enlarged on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees twenty thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-IV, Sasaram, Rohtas, in connection with **Complaint Case No. 678 of 2024**, subject to conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, on further condition:

(i) The petitioner is directed to remain physically present before the learned trial Court on each and every date, failing which on two consecutive dates without reasonable cause, the bail bond of the petitioner is liable to be cancelled.

7. If so advised, either of the parties will be at liberty to make an application before the Court below for referring the matter to the District Mediation Centre for the purpose of reconciliation or one time settlement.

8. This application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Shahnawaz/-

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

