

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.79155 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2077 Year-2024 Thana- SAMASTIPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Samastipur

=====

Rahul Kumar Gupta S/O Mahesh Kumar Gupta Presently R/at Flat No.- 904,
Bing D.G.K. Rose Aster, Gaikwad Nagar, Punawale, P.S.- Ravetpur, Distt.-
Pune, Maharashtra. Permanent R/o mohalla- Indrapur house no. 33, road no.
9A, Near shiv mandir road, P.S.- Patliputra, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar bihar
2. Sneha Surbhi D/O Vijay Kumar R/O Rambabu Chowk, Gandhi Gali, Ward
no. 20, Under Nagar Nigam Samastipur, P.S.- Samastipur Town, Dist.-
Samastipur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Madhav Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anil Kumar Singh No. 1, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 17-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case in
connection with Samastipur Complaint Case No. 2077 of 2024
registered for the offences punishable u/ss 115(2), 85, 74,
303(1), 352 read with Section 3(5) of the B.N.S. 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 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. It is further submitted that the petitioner is the husband of the informant and he has no concern with the alleged offence. The petitioner neither demanded any dowry nor tortured the informant. 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, Samastipur in connection with Samastipur Complaint Case No. 2077 of 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 bond of the petitioner is 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)

Gautam/-

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

