

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64933 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-9 Year-2025 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Bhojpur

Anil Kumar S/o- Kameshwar Prasad Resident of Rampur Pandura P.S- Sandesh, Dist- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Nitu Kumari W/o- Anil Kumar Resident of Rampur Pandura P.S- Sandesh, Dist- Bhojpur, P/A- Khajuriya Po- Khajuriya Ps- Ara Muffasil Dist-Bhojpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ravindra Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar No. 2, APP
For the Informant/s	:	Mr. Rajendra Nath Sinha, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH SINGH

ORAL ORDER

3 04-11-2025 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 Bhojpur Mahila P.S. Case No. 09 of 2025 dated 20.01.2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 323, 498A, 504, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 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 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. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner who is the husband of the informant. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the informant. It is further submitted that the petitioner has filed divorce case having Divorce Case No. 495 of 2024 dated 18.11.2024 which is pending in the Court of Principal Judge-2. 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 and 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, Bhojpur at Ara in connection with Bhojpur Mahila P.S. Case No. 09 of 2025, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C., 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)

shivam/-

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

