

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34286 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-549 Year-2025 Thana- CHAKIA District- East Champaran

Md. Zahir @ Md. Zahid Hussain S/o Late Md. Safur Ansari R/o vill -
Kalyanpur, PS- Kalyanpur, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Raj Kishor Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 19-05-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Chakia P.S. Case No. 549 of 2025 for allegedly having committed offence under Sections 69, 64, 318(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S. as well as Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, which has been lodged on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant to the effect that the marriage of the daughter of the informant was solemnised with Md. Ishtiaq. On 10.06.2025, five persons came to see the girl and after consent of the parties, the marriage was solemnised. Some gold ornaments were given at that time. It has further been alleged that the boy met the daughter of the informant and obtained her mobile number and started



communicating with her. He took her to a place and established physical relationship with her. Later on, he refused to marry the girl and the petitioner went to the house of the informant and demanded a Scarpio vehicle and said that if the same will not be given, the boy is not agreeable for the marriage.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence rather. The prosecution story is entirely false and baseless. He submits that the date of occurrence is 20.06.2026 and the First Information Report has been lodged on 13.10.2025 i.e. after a delay of about 3 months and 23 days, which has not been explained in the First Information Report. He further submits that prior to the present First Information Report, the informant proposed the marriage in between the daughter of the informant and the son of the petitioner, claiming that both are in love, however petitioner and his family members refused for the said proposal. He submits that to put pressure upon the petitioner, so that the informant can marry his daughter with the son of the petitioner, the present case has been lodged against the petitioner and his family members. The petitioner has got a clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes a prayer for bail



of the petitioner and submits that the due to illegal demand of the petitioner, the marriage, which was fixed in between the parties, has not been solemnised.

6. Having considering the rival submissions and after going through the records, it appears that the First Information Report has been lodged on 13.10.2025, for the occurrence, which is said to have taken place on 20.06.2025 i.e. after a delay of about 3 months 23 days and no explanation whatsoever has been given by the informant in the First Information Report. It has further transpired that the petitioner has got a clean antecedent. Considering the above let the petitioner, above named in the event of arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari in connection with Chakia P.S. Case No. 549 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, with further condition:

(1) The learned Court concerned shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it



is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents, the court concerned shall take steps for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

Ajay/Pallavi/-

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

