

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69681 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-283 Year-2018 Thana- MOTIHARI MUFASIL District- East
Champaran

Rajeev Ranjan S/O Vishwananth Prasad Yadav R/O Village- Paigambarpur,
P.S- Saraiya, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sara D/O Ashok Kumar and W/O Rajiv Ranjan R/O Village- Lakshmiपुर,
P.S- Mufassil, District- East Champaran

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Ashutosh Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Ajit Kumar
	Mr. Shashank Shekhar

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

15 12-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 323, 313, 328, 420, 467 and 498A of the Indian Penal Code, Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, Sections 22 and 23 of the PCPNDT Act and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution case is based upon an FIR filed by the opposite party no. 2 in which she has made an allegation of demand of dowry and torture. Petitioner is the husband of opposite party no.2.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations levelled in the FIR are not correct and as a matter of



fact, it was the informant who did not perform her marital obligations due to which there was a matrimonial discord between the parties. However, the records of the case would demonstrate that the parties had agreed to settle the issues by way of payment of Rs. 55,00,000/- along with SUV vehicle by the petitioner to the opposite party no. 2 as one time settlement.

5. From the order dated 22.04.2025, it would be evident that an amount of Rs. 15,00,000/- was already paid to the opposite party no. 2 and subsequently out of the remaining Rs. 40,00,000/-, the petitioner has paid another Rs. 10,00,000/- which makes it a total of Rs. 25,00,000/- and Rs. 30,00,000/- still remains to be paid. It has also been submitted that the SUV vehicle was also handed over to the opposite party no. 2 but the same has been returned to the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in another one month time he would be able to make payment of half of the remaining amount which will be Rs. 15,00,000/-.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that a substantial payment has already been made to the opposite party no. 2 and that the petitioner is also agreeable on making payment of another Rs. 15,00,000/- within one month, this Court is inclined to confirm



the provisional bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 28.03.2024.

7. It goes without saying that in case the petitioner does not abide by his words and does not make the payment of remaining Rs. 15,00,000/- within a period of one month, the opposite party no. 2 shall have the liberty to pray for cancellation of bail bonds of the petitioner. Further, the parties would also, after making the rest of the payment, enter into a compromise to end all litigation between them.

8. This application is, accordingly, disposed of.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

devendra/-

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

