

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.56159 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-320 Year-2022 Thana- NAWADAH COMPLAINT CASE
District- Nawada

=====

JITENDRA PRASAD YADAV @ JITENDRA YADAV S/O RAMSAWROOP
YADAV Resident Of Village- Bajra, P.O- Bagodar, P.S.- Hisua, District-
Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR
2. PUJA KUMARI D/O BALMUKUND YADAV R/O VILLAGE- GOVIND
BIGHA, P.S- AKBARPUR, DISTT.- NAWADA.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sheo Kumar Prasad, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Ram Priya Sharan Singh, APP.
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Pramod Kumar Verma, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

7 06-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for
the State and learned counsel for the complainant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 494, 323 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, but the cognizance has been taken under Sections 498(A), 494 of the Indian Penal Code and 4 of the D.P. Act against the petitioner.

3. Petitioner, who is husband of complainant, is said to have tortured upon her physically and mentally in association of



his family members over the dowry demand.

4. Vide order dated 14.11.2024, it would appear that earlier the matter was referred to the Mediation Centre, Patna High Court for resolving the dispute between the parties. The report received from the Mediation Centre, however, discloses that the said mediation between the parties has failed.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that all the allegations levelled against the petitioner are not correct and as a matter of fact, the petitioner had all intention of settling the disputes between him and the complainant, but it was the complainant who did not want to live with the petitioner in her matrimonial home despite a Panchayati having been done for the same. It is further submitted that petitioner will neither abscond nor tamper with the evidence rather will cooperate in the investigation.

6. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel appearing for the complainant oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail supporting the allegations made in the complaint.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner makes an offer that the petitioner would make the payment of Rs. 3000.00/- (Rupees Three Thousand) per month to the



complainant in the second week of every month to which learned counsel for the complainant agrees.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, let the above named petitioner, be released on bail, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, 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 Court below where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Complaint Case No. 320 of 2022, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

9. It goes without saying that the aforesaid payment shall be subject to any order being passed in matrimonial maintenance case or any other collateral proceedings.

10. Learned counsel for the complainant is directed to furnish the bank account details of the complainant in the learned Court below. If the complainant fails to furnish the same, the aforesaid amount will be deposited in the learned Court below which will be released in favour of the complainant after she furnishes her bank account details. If the petitioner fails to pay the aforesaid amount on two consecutive months, the complainant shall be at liberty to move before the learned



Court below for cancelling the bail bond of the petitioner.

11. Accordingly, this application stands disposed of.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

divyanshi/-

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

