

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63729 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-287 Year-2024 Thana- MADHEPURA COMPALINT CASE  
District- Madhepura

Md. Aftab Alam Son of Late Islam Resident of Piluwaha, Ward No. 06, P.S.-  
Jadiya, District- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Chamantara W/o Md. Aftab Alam and D/o Md. Mehndi Hussain R/o -  
Piluwaha, Ward no. 06, P.S. - Jadiya, Dist. - Supaul, at present residing at  
Puraini, Ward no. 14, P.S. - Shreenagar, Dist. - Madehpura.

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                          |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Patla Kumari         |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Pradeep Narain Kumar |
| For the Informant        | : | Mr. Rupesh Kumar         |

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

ORAL ORDER

3      11-11-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned  
counsel for the informant and learned Additional Public  
Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in  
connection with Complaint Case No. 287C of 2024, CIS No.  
287/2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections  
147, 341, 323, 379, 307, 504, 506 and 498A read with 34 of the  
Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 & 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 complainant  
mentally and physically due to non-fulfillment of demand of



dowry.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. There is a general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner who is the husband of the complainant. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the complainant. 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 in para 3 of the bail petition.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances



of the case, let the above named petitioner, in the event of his arrest/surrender 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 the learned court concerned, Madhepura in connection with Complaint Case No. 287C of 2024, CIS No. 287/2024, subject to conditions as laid down under section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S, with further condition:-

(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 bonds of the petitioner are 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)**

atul/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

