

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86768 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1949 Year-2022 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Araria

Md. Azam @ Mohammad Aazam @ Azam Hussain S/O AlA Uddin R/O Vill.-
Karahmana, Ward no. 13, P.S.- Jokihat, Dist.- Araria.... .. Petitioner/s
Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Bibi Munira Begam w/o Md. Azam @ Azam Hussain @ Mohammad Aazam
Resident of village- Karahmana, Ward No. 13, P.S. Jokihat, District- Araria,
Present Address- D/O- Hasibur Rahman, Resident of village- Ghormara, P.S.
Mahlgaon, District- Araria ... Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Gopal Kumar Jha, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr.Asha Kumari, APP
For O.P. No. 2	:	Mr. Wasi Akhtar, Adv. Mr. Shahid Jawed, Adv.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

6 09-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as
the learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Complaint Case No. 1949 of 2022, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 498(A) of the IPC.

3. According to complaint petition, the marriage of
the complainant, *Bibi Munira Begum* was solemnized with the
petitioner four years prior to lodging of the complaint petition.
When she came to her matrimonial house, it came to her
knowledge that the petitioner was a married person. A
panchayati was convened and the complainant started residing
with the petitioner. Further, she alleged that the accused persons



pressured her to demand Rs. 2 lakhs and a motorcycle from her *maike*. Due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry, she was tortured and, ultimately, she was ousted from her matrimonial house.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He has further submitted that the petitioner is a person of clean antecedent.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant submits that concealing the fact that he was already married, the petitioner solemnized marriage with the complainant. He has further submitted that the matter was referred to the mediation centre, but the petitioner did not appear before the mediation centre, whereas the opposite party no. 2 along with learned counsel appeared before the mediation centre, which shows the apathy and reluctance on the part of the petitioner in resolution of the dispute.

6. In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail, which is hereby *rejected*.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/-

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

