

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10295 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-375 Year-2025 Thana- KARAHGAR District- Rohtas

Sushil Kumar Rai @ Sushil Rai S/O Baban Rai R/O Village- Riwa, P.S-
Kargahar, Distt.- Rohtas at Sasaram, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Rakesh Mohan Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mrs. Suman Kumari Singh, A.P.P.
	Mr. N.K. Agrawal, Senior Advocate
	Mr. Raghunandan Kumar Singh, Advocate
	Mr. Harendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

5 15-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Petitioner apprehends arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under sections 83, 69 and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023, sections 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per prosecution case, petitioner committed sexual intercourse several times with the informant under the false promise of marriage. It is further alleged that the petitioner, with fraudulent intention, knowing that he is not thereby lawfully married, performed marriage with the informant. It has been further alleged that subsequently petitioner married to her in Tara Chandi temple and after that he expelled her from his



house for payment of demand of dowry amount of rupees 10 lacs.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that informant is major aged about 31 years. As a matter of fact, informant, for purchase of land, came in contact with the petitioner and thereafter by taking undue advantage she falsely implicated the petitioner along with his family members with a view to grab money. No physical relation or marriage ever took place between the petitioner and the informant save and except telephonic communications and public meetings. Present F.I.R. was instituted only when the petitioner and his family members refused to succumb before the illegal demand of money made by the informant but also took the legal recourse by filing informatory petition. Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the State and the informant opposed the prayer for bail. Learned counsel for the informant has filed counter affidavit substantiating the allegations made in the F.I.R. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the petitioner is named in the F.I.R with specific allegation that on the false promise of marriage petitioner repeatedly committed



rape with informant. During investigation, several witnesses have supported the prosecution case.

6. Considering the nature and gravity of accusation, prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Shashi

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

