

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA  
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77720 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-220 Year-2021 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - BIKRAMGANJ  
District- Rohtas

=====

Kamlesh Singh @ Kamlesh Kumar Singh Son of Late Baburam Singh R/o  
Village- Barwadih, P.O.- Saraiya, P.S.- Hariharganj, District- Palamu  
(Jharkhand)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Pinki Kumari Wife of Kamlesh Singh, D/o- Lakshmi Ray R/o Village-  
It6wan, P.O.- Bahura, P.S.- Dawath, District- Rohtas (Bihar)

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uma Kant Mishra, Adv.  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Gauri Shankar Gupta, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2      11-11-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
  
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in  
connection with Complaint Case No. 220 of 2021 dated  
25.07.2021 registered for the offence punishable under Sections  
323, 498A of the I.P.C 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 complainant  
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 complainant. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the complainant. It is further submitted that there is no injury report mentioned in the impugned order. 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 has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner by submitting that the specific allegation of inflicting blow of knife is against 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, Bikramganj, Rohtas in connection with Complaint Case No. 220 of 2021, 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)**

shivam/-

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

