

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49203 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-42 Year-2025 Thana- BHABHU(KAIMUR) COMPLAIN C
District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

=====

Nandan Kumar S/O Ram Awadh Bind @ Awadh Bind R/O Village- Bahuara,
P.S- Sonha, Distt.- Kaimur at Bhabua.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Pooja Kumari W/O Nandan Kumar R/O Village- Bahuara, P.S- Sonhan,
Distt.- Kaimur at Bhabua, At present R/O Village- Chitadhi, P.O- Parvatpur,
P.S- Chainpur, Distt.- Kaimur at Bhabua.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Tribhuwan Narayan
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Shyameshwar Dayal
For the Informant	:	Mr. Raghwendra Pratap Singh

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 04-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

counsel for the informant as well as learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case in
connection with Bhabhua Complaint Case No. 42 of 2025 registered
for the offence/s punishable u/ss 115(2), 85, 316(2), 352, 353, 351,
351(4), 127 read with section 3(5) of the BNS and 4 of the DP Act
but the cognizance has been taken only u/s 85 of the BNS and section
4 of the D.P. Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner and the co-
accused persons are alleged to have tortured the informant mentally
and physically due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner is the husband of the informant. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the informant. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. Learned counsel for 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 498A of the IPC 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 & Anr passed in Criminal Appeal No(s). 2207 of 2023 arising out of Special Leave Petition (CRL.) No. 3433 of 2023**. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated at para 3 of the bail petition.

5. Learned counsel for the informant as well as learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner has already contracted second marriage with another woman within one year after his first marriage.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the allegation being general and omnibus, let the above named petitioner, in the event of his arrest/surrender within a



period of six weeks from today, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees twenty thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court concerned, Kaimur, Bhabhua in connection with Bhabhua Complaint Case No. 42 of 2025, subject to conditions as laid down under section 482(2) of the BNSS, with further condition/s:-

(i) The petitioner is directed to remain physically present before the learned Court below 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. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

guddukr/-

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

