

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.54859 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-625 Year-2024 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
Rohtas

=====

Dr Pradeep Kumar Singh @ Pradeep Singh S/O Hare Ram Singh Resident Of
Solanki House, Bhuyian Dih Near Bank of Baroda, P.S.- Sitaramdera, Dist.-
East Singhbhum (Jharkhand)-831009

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Dr Anupama Chauhan @ Kumari Anupama Chauhan D/O Arjun Kumar
Singh R/O Lane No. 10C, Kalavati Kunj, ekta chowk, P.S.- Sasaram, Dist.-
Rohtas, Bihar-831009

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mrs. Nivedita Nirvikar, Sr. Advocate Mr. Amarshakti, Advcoate Mr. Shashank Shekhar, Advocate Ms. Riya Raj, Advocate
For the Opposite Party No.1:		Ms. Pushpa Sinha, APP
For the Opposite party No.2:		Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate Mr. Sanjay Sinha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 21-01-2026 Heard Ms. Nivedita Nirvikar, learned Senior counsel

assisted by Mr. Amarshakti, learned counsel, for the petitioner,

Mr. Sanjay Verma, learned counsel assisted by Mr. Sanjay

Sinha, learned counsel, for the opposite party no.2 and Ms.

Pushpa Sinha, learned APP for the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with

Complaint Case No.625 of 2024 registered for the offences

under Sections 498(A) & 504 of the Indian Penal Code and



Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961.

3. As per the prosecution case, the complainant has alleged that during her marriage, her father had given Rs.30,00,000/- in cash and gold jewelry worth Rs.15,00,000/- as a gift, however, after few weeks of her marriage, her mother-in-law and sister-in-law Priya Singh started mocking her for getting less dowry and often pressurized the complainant for bringing money from her parents. It is further alleged that the petitioner, being the husband, also demanded Rs.50,00,000/- from the complainant for building a hospital and on account of non-fulfillment of the same, petitioner started abusing the complainant.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the present case is a fallout of strained relationship between the petitioner no.1 and opposite party no.2. It has been submitted that the petitioner happens to be a doctor and is a child specialist and false and frivolous allegations of demand of Rs.50,00,000/- for construction of hospital has been levelled only to settle personal scores.

5. Learned Senior counsel pointed out that the Petitioner, observing that his wife had not been behaving well, had even visited a psychiatrist, who disclosed that his wife was



suffering from a disease, namely, Morbid Jealousy. It has been submitted that in fact this disease is genetic in the complainant's family and even the brother-in-law of the petitioner, namely, Abishek Anand, is getting treated for schizophrenia.

6. Learned Senior counsel has referred to the medical prescription brought on record by way of Annexure P-2 and has also drawn the attention of this Court towards Annexure P-3 which are the bills and receipts which have been paid by the petitioner even during the marriage, contrary to the claim of the complainant. Learned Senior counsel has further taken this Court to Annexure P-4, which is the informatory petition lodged by the petitioner way back in 24.03.2023 apprehending false implication by the complainant and ultimately because of her attitude and looking at the fact that the relationship won't survive, a Matrimonial Suit No. 955 of 2023 was also filed on 23.12.2023 in the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Jamsedpur and notice was issued to the opposite party no.2/complainant. It has been submitted by the learned Senior counsel that it was on account of such notice being received by the opposite party no.2 that the present complaint was filed with false and frivolous allegations and in fact this was the reason for the strained relationship, as the complainant was in the habit of



picking fights on trivial issues. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

7. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and have stated that the allegation of petitioner being mentally unsound or suffering from some disease is all false and concocted and it is the subject matter of inquiry. It has next been submitted that there is specific allegation of demand of dowry for construction of hospital and abuse against the petitioner. It has also been stated that the petitioner has been ill-treating the complainant and ultimately, after being subjected to cruelty, the present case under Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code was lodged.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, let the petitioner above named be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/-(ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Complaint Case No.625 of 2024, subject to the conditions as



laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure read with corresponding Section 482(2) of B.N.S.S. as well as subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his close relative.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates, or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.

(vi) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step 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.

9. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail is allowed.

10. It is made clear that the observation, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/-

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

