

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82212 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-28 Year-2024 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Jehanabad

Manish Kumar S/O Late Kouleshwar Paswan @ Kameshwar Paswan
Resident Of Village - Kalpa Kala, P.S- Kalpa, Dist.- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Nityanand Neeraj, Adv. Ms. Kumari Anjani Sinha, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Kumar Ranjit Ranjan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 08-12-2025 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 Mahila P.S. Case No. 28/2024 dated 23.06.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 341, 325, 498A read with Section 34 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 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. It is further submitted that the informant was married with one Ashish Maurya and thereafter she filed a Complaint Case No. 547/2022 (Annexure-P/3) against him and without getting divorce, she contracted second marriage with the petitioner. 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 has 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, Jehanabad in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No. 28/2024, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 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)

shivam/-

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

