

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9256 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-52 Year-2022 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Araria

Uplesh Kumar Rai @ Uplesh Rai S/O Shivanand Roy R/O Ward no. - 08,
Lakhna, P.S- Kasba, Dist- Purnia

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar and Anr.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Dheeraj Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :	Ms.Asha Devi
	None

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

7 10-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
though complainant is not impleaded as opposite party no.2, but
then, learned Advocate Md. Naushad Uzzoha appeared on her
behalf *sue moto*.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 147,323,341,498A,34 of the Indian Penal Code and
Sections 3 and 4 of the D. P. Act, but cognizance has been taken
only under Section 498(A) of the I.P.C. and Sections 3 and 4 of
the D. P. Act.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



the dispute is matrimonial and the petitioner being husband has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the complainant. It is also submitted that a second supplementary affidavit has been filed wherein it has been specifically pleaded at Para-2 that petitioner was ready to keep the complainant as his legally wedded wife, but then, complainant was not ready and subsequently, she performed marriage with Pradip Kumar Rai son of Chamru Lal Rai, resident of village Thubhri, Panchayat Kesra, Jokihat, District- Araria. It is also pleaded that mother of Pradeep Kumar is Amlawati Devi and the complainant presently is working as an Aanganwari Sevika. It is next submitted that this perhaps explains why no one is appearing on behalf of the complainant. It is further submitted that the case earlier was taken up on 06.02.2026, on the said date also, no one had appeared on behalf of the complainant and today when the case is taken up, again no one appears on behalf of the complainant.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on bail



on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Complaint Case No.52(C) of 2022, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

7. The application stands allowed.

8. However, the complainant would be at liberty to file an application seeking cancellation of bail granted to the petitioner, in the event, if anticipatory bail has been obtained based on a false fact that complainant has married Pradip Kumar Rai.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

