IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15374 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010167202026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-308 Year-2019 Thana- JEHANABAD COMPLAINT CASE District- Jehanabad

==========

Khurram @ Khurram Abdullah @ Kharam @ Kharam Abdullah S/o Sallan Miyan @ Rafay Nabi @ Rafi Nabi R/o Village - Serthua, P.S - Jehanabad, District - Jehanabad

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Nikhat Praween W/o Khurram @ Khurram Abdullah @ Kharam D/o Md. Salauddin, R/o Village - Irki, P.S - Jehanabad, District - Jehanabad

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ramesh Chandra, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

7 20-11-2026 Heard Mr. Sunil Kumar, learned Advocate for the petitioner and Mr. Ramesh Chandra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner happens to be the husband of the opposite party No. 2 apprehends his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 308 of 2019, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A) of IPC and Section 3/4 of the D.P. Act.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is that he demanded dowry and subjected the opposite party No. 2 to torture on account of non-fulfilment of the same; besides

WEB COPY

driving her out of the matrimonial home.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the marriage between the petitioner and opposite party No. 2 was a love marriage. However, subsequently, on account of certain differences between the parties, a matrimonial dispute arose, resulting in the institution of the present complaint case. Moreover, the learned Court has taken cognizance only under Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. The petitioner has always been ready to keep the opposite party No. 2 with dignity and honour; however, for reasons unknown to the petitioner, the opposite party No. 2 does not want to reside with him. It is next contended that, be that as it may, the petitioner bears fair antecedents and he undertakes that he will fully cooperate in the proceedings of the Court.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State vehemently opposes the bail application and submits that cognizance was taken in the year 2019 and that the petitioner has approached this Court after such a long lapse of time.

6. Considering the submissions advanced by learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the nature of accusation and the dispute which has arisen on account of

WEB COPY

matrimonial discord between the husband and wife, as also the undertaking of the petitioner that he will fully co-operate in the proceedings of the Court, let the petitioner above named be released on bail, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Jehanabad in connection with Complaint Case No. 308 of 2019, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, with the further condition that one of the bailors shall be the own/close family members of the petitioner.

(Harish Kumar, J)

sumit/-

U		T	

WEB COPY