

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25507 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-827 Year-2024 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Araria

Manikant Kumar Singh @ Manikant Singh S/O Rohit Kumar Singh Resident
of Village- Dainia, Ward No.- 06, Police Station- Sikty, District- Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Priyanka Kumari W/O Manikant Kumar Singh R/O Village- Dainia, Ward No.-06, P.S- Sikty, Distt.- Araria. At present- D/O Nityanand Bahaldar, R/O Village- Diyari, Ward No.-09, P.S and Distt.- Araria.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ramesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Shyam Bihari Singh, APP
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Pankaj Kumar Jha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

7 13-02-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No.827C of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code and section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, lodged by the complainant Priyanka Kumari.

3. As per the prosecution story, the complainant alleged that she got married to the petitioner on 29.06.2020 but was always tortured for dowry and the further allegation is that on the fateful day, she was brutally assaulted and was not even extended any medical assistance. She was assaulted even when the lady was pregnant. Further, when the child arrived in this



world, the infant was taken care of so shabbily that he died within a fortnight. When she complained that her child was not properly taken care of resulting into death, was again assaulted. A panchayati was held but on 30.08.2023, the allegation is that after taking all her ornaments/clothes, she was thrown out of the house. The further allegation is that the petitioner subsequently married one Sonam. Left with no option, the present complaint was filed by her.

4. In this case, on 07.05.2025, the opposite party was noticed and considering the inclination shown by both of them, they were allowed to remain present on 22.08.2025. Further, as they wanted to continue with their relationship, the matter was adjourned to 10.10.2025.

5. However, on 10.10.2025, when the couple presented themselves, the intent of the husband was very clear. He was not ready to continue with the marital relationship. Mr. Pankaj Kumar Jha, learned counsel for the informant has brought on record the facts of the case supporting the complaint and two of the photographs which are part of the record (copies served upon learned counsel for the petitioner) clearly show the intimate relationship that this petitioner is having with the lady, Sonam.



6. Learned counsel for the petitioner in defence submits that neither he has performed second marriage nor any assault took place and/or any ill treatment led to the death of the newly born child. On the contrary, the lady is in the habit of leaving the home.

7. This Court earlier gave a long rope to the petitioner under the impression that he will come to terms. However, it seems that he wants to move further with his alleged second wife. The allegation as per the supplementary affidavit shows that even after this Court wanted them to continue together, the second complaint has been filed by the O.P. No.2 vide **Complaint Case No. 1879C of 2025 under section 126(2), 115, 352, 85, 109, 318(2), 82(1) and 3(5) of the B.N.S.** alleging that he again resorted to the assault when she went with him. This despite the fact that the lady went to his house under the order of this Court.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the complaint case are completely false and the photographs that have been attached with the counter affidavit showing the injuries have been inflicted by the lady herself only to implicate him.

9. Whatever alibi the learned counsel for the petitioner wants to put forward, this Court has recorded all the



facts of the case as also the development that took place in between. The petitioner despite taking the lady to his home again assaulted her for which a complaint case has been filed. This Court has also seen the photographs of the petitioner with other lady. Allegation of ill treatment as also not extending any medical assistance to the newly born is/are there.

10. This takes the Court to only one conclusion. The petitioner is not entitled to any relief. The anticipatory bail application is rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

