

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48286 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-803 Year-2024 Thana- BEGUSARAI COMPLAINT CASE
District- Begusarai

=====

Munna Singh @ Munna Kumar Singh S/O Ucceheshwar Singh R/O Vill.-
Katarmala, P.S.- Dandari, Dist.- Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Renu Devi W/O Munna Singh R/O Vill.- Katarmala, P.S.- Dandari, Dist.-
Begusarai. at Present R/O Vill.- Hasanpur, P.S.- Hasanpur, Dist.- Begusarai.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. S.K. Lal, Sr. Advocate
For the State : Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha, APP
For the complainant : Mr. Sandip Kumar Gautam, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-08-2025 Heard Mr. S.K. Lal, learned Senior counsel for the

petitioner, Mr. Sandip Kumar Gautam, learned counsel for O.P.

No. 2 and Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No. 803 of 2024 for the
offences punishable under Section 498A of the Indian Penal
Code.

3. According to prosecution case, the complainant
alleges that her husband, Munna Singh, and his family
demanded that her to sell her share of her paternal property and
give the money as dowry. When she could not comply, they



tortured and assaulted. Her husband eventually married another woman and ousted the complainant and their children from his house citing her failure to provide the demanded money.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offences as alleged in the F.I.R. and for the same set of allegation, the complainant had already filed a complaint case No. 287(C) of 2017 under Section 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code and for the same set of allegation, the complainant has filed present case against the petitioner. The previous complaint petition being complaint case No. 287(C) of 2017 is pending before the competent Court of law and is at the stage of evidence wherein complainant has been examined herself before the learned Trial Court. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that for the same set of allegation complainant had filed this case only to harass the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the complainant as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that during the pendency of the first and second complaint petition, the



petitioner has performed the second marriage, but fairly submits that learned Court below has not taken cognizance under the provisions of Section 494 of the IPC.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts that for the same set of allegation, the complainant has filed the present petition and the first complaint petition is at the state of the evidence, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Begusarai in connection with Complaint Case No. 803 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita and with other following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the



witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

saauravkrsinha/-

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

