

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52553 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-328 Year-2024 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - ROSERA
District- Samastipur

=====

Gaurav Kumar @ Gaurb Singh S/o Mani Kumar Singh R/o Village - Soha,
P.S - Sonbersha, District - Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Meenu Kumari W/o Gaurav kumar R/o Village - Soha, P.S - Sonbersha,
District - Samastipur At present address - Meenu Kumari, D/o Late
Umashankar Singh, R/o Village - Singhiya, P.S - Singhiya, District -
Samastipur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vivekanand Singh, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Satyendra Narain Singh, APP
For the O.P.No. 2	:	Mr. Gagandeo Yadav, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 18-11-2025 Heard Mr. Vivekanand Singh, learned Advocate for

the petitioner and Mr. Satyendra Narain Singh, learned

Additional Public Prosecutor for the State. Opposite party No. 2

is represented through Mr. Gagandeo Yadav, learned Advocate.

2. The petitioner happens to be husband of opposite
party no. 2 is apprehending his arrest in connection with C.R.
No.328 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under
Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/4 of the
Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. The marriage of the parties was solemnised on
10.06.2021. It is specifically alleged that the petitioner is a
Software Engineer working in Bangalore and at the time of



marriage the petitioner along with other co accused took huge dowry. However, later on the petitioner and his family members started torturing the opposite party no. 2 and finally ousted from the matrimonial home which led to filing of the complaint case.

4. On the last occasion, considering the materials available on record that the dispute has arisen on account of matrimonial discord, the matter was referred to the Patna High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre where both the parties had appeared. However, in spite of best efforts, the dispute between the parties could not resolve through the process of mediation.

5. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that though there is complete denial of allegation of demand of dowry and torture but this fact cannot be ignored that the opposite party no. 2 is legally wedded wife and on all places the petitioner has stated that he is ready to keep her with all honour and dignity but because of certain reasons, the same could not be done. However, on instruction, learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that he is ready to pay an amount of Rs.5,000/- per month in order to discharge his matrimonial.

6. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State



and the opposite party no. 2 vehemently opposed the bail application.

7. The opposite party no. 2 is also present in Court. It is specifically stated that before institution of the FIR, the petitioner left her unattended and no financial assistance is being made. There is none in her family to look after and as such, she is unable to maintain herself. However, learned Advocate for the opposite party no. 2 submits that the petitioner has been working as Software Engineer and he should be directed to pay an amount of Rs.10,000/- so that she can any how cope with the situation and maintain her. The opposite party no. 2 further submits that she has always been ready to live with the petitioner but it is the petitioner who refused to keep her.

8. Taking note of the pitiable condition of the opposite party no. 2, this Court directs the petitioner to deposit an amount of Rs.7,000/- per month in the account of the opposite party no. 2 for which she shall produce the Bank account within a period of two weeks. On furnishing Bank account, the petitioner shall deposit an amount of Rs.7,000/- in the last week of every month, till any order is passed by the competent court in any other matter. On failure of two consecutive months in paying the



monthly amount, the opposite party no. 2 shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail before the court below itself.

9. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Advocates for the respective parties and taking note of the materials available on record, let the petitioner abovenamed be released on bail, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Rosera, Samastipur in connection with C.R. No. 328 of 2024, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, with the further condition that one of the bailors shall be the own/close family members of the petitioner.

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anjani/-

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

