

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69493 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-699 Year-2023 Thana- BHABHU(KAIMUR) COMPLAIN C
District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

=====

Chandan Kumar S/O Baliram Ram Resident of Village - Ramauli, P.S.-
Chainpur, District - Kaimur (Bhabua)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1 . The State of Bihar
- 2. Soni Kumari W/O Chandan Kumar, D/O Late Balkaran Ram At present
Resident of Village- Sherpur, P.S- Chainpur, Distt.- Kaimur (Bhabua).

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kumar Sunil , Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sharda Kumari , APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 08-01-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

State .

2. Petitioner apprehends arrest in a case registered for
the offence punishable under sections 498 (A) of the IPC and 3/
4 of the D. P Act.

3 . As per the prosecution case , complainant
solemnized married with this petitioner in the year 2022 and
after the marriage, when she went to her matrimonial house, she



was subjected to torture and cruelty by this petitioner and other in-laws family members due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry and lastly, she was ousted from her matrimonial house .

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case . No occurrence as alleged has ever taken place . This case has been filed against the petitioner by the complainant only with a view to put pressure upon the petitioner and his family members to make the partition in the property and divide the share of informant.

5 . Learned counsel for the complainant opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that there is specific allegation against the petitioner that he along with other in-laws family members committed torture and harassment to the complainant due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry and lastly, ousted complainant from her matrimonial house .

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, petitioner is husband and there is specific allegation is alleged against him. From the record, it also appears that complainant tried her best to make conjugal life with this petitioner but petitioner refused to keep the complainant and also refused to pay any maintenance to her. Being husband, petitioner is duty-bound to



provide maintenance to his wife but he refused to do so and as
such prayer for pre-arrest bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Koushik/-

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

