

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23637 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2024 Thana- LAUHIYANAGAR District- Begusarai

1. Kalawati Devi @ Kalavati Devi W/o- Sri Ashok Kumar Singh @ Arbind Singh, Resident of Village-Daudpur, P.O and P.S-Kalpa District-Jehanabad.
2. Anjali Kumari D/o- Sri Ashok Kumar Singh @ Arbind Singh, Resident of Village-Daudpur, P.O and P.S-Kalpa, District-Jehanabad.
3. Akash Kumar Singh @ Manish Singh, S/o- Sri Ashok Kumar Singh @ Arbind Singh, Resident of Village-Daudpur, P.O and P.S- Kalpa, District-Jehanabad.
4. Abhimanyu Kumar @ Abhimanyu Singh, S/o- Sri Ashok Kumar Singh @ Arvind Singh, Resident of Village-Daudpur, P.O and P.S- Kalpa, District-Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Sudhir kumar Singh s/o Late Narayan Prasad Singh R/O-village-Lohianagar P.S. Lohianagar, ward no-28, Dist-Begusarai.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Pushpa Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

5 19-01-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on

behalf of the State.

2. The accused/petitioners apprehending their arrest in
connection with Lohianagar P.S. Case No. 55 of 2024 registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 34 of the
Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per FIR, petitioners refused to marry the daughter
of the informant due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry.



4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners that due to certain personal reasons, when the marriage of petitioner no. 4 could not solemnize with the daughter of the informant, the present false implication was raised, making allegation of dowry demand. It is submitted that upon perusal of FIR, it nowhere appears that any demand of dowry was actually made by petitioners and there is nothing on record which may suggest that any cash transaction was done between informant and petitioners. It is further submitted that even the demand of allegation *qua* dowry is appearing very much general and omnibus in nature and, moreover, the allegation as set out through the FIR, nowhere suggest ingredients of the offences as alleged punishable under Sections 420 and 406 of the Indian Penal Code on its face. While concluding argument, it is submitted that petitioners are of clean antecedents.

5. Learned APP opposed the prayer of bail.

6. In view of aforesaid factual submissions and by taking note of fact as demand of dowry appears very much general and omnibus against petitioners, where *prima facie* upon perusal of FIR, it nowhere appears that any transaction was made between informant and petitioners, who are of clean antecedents, accordingly, all above named petitioners, in the event of their



arrest or surrender before the learned trial Court, within a period of four weeks of the order, is directed to be released on bail furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Begusarai/concerned Court, where the case is pending in connection with Lohianagar P.S. Case No. 55 of 2024 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J)

veena/-

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

