

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65141 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1012 Year-2024 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Araria

Sunil Kumar Ram @ Sunil Kumar Son of Mangal ram Resident of Village -
Sindhiya Dhuniya Tola, Ward number - 10, P.S. - K Nagar, District - Purnia.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Rupa Devi W/o Sunil Kumar Ram, D/o Fudan Ram R/o Village - Sindhiya, Dhuniya Tola, Ward no. 10, P.S. - K. Nagar, Dist. - Purnia, Present address - Village - jamuniy Tola, Bistroriya, Ward no. 21, P.S. - Raniganj, Dist. - Araria.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Gopal Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/state:		Mr.Nawal Kishore Pd., A.P.P.
For the informant	:	Mr. Dheeraj Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. R.K. Priyadarshi, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 01-04-2026 1. Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 1012 / 2024 dated 10.06.2024 registered under Sections 147 / 323 / 379 / 498(A) / 504 of the I.P.C.

3. As per the complaint case marriage of the complainant with the petitioner was solemnized about five years ago. It has further been alleged that after marriage the petitioner along with his family members started demanding dowry and due to non fulfillment of the demand, the complainant was tortured physically and mentally. On 29.02.2024 all the accused persons including the petitioner assaulted the complainant and threw her



away from her matrimonial home.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. There was incompatibility between the husband and wife and the allegation of demand of dowry and torture is general and omnibus in nature against all the family members. The petitioner never demanded any dowry from the complainant and he wanted to keep the complainant with full dignity and honour. The matter was send for mediation where the girl refused to stay with the petitioner because she has performed marriage with another person.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that it is not true that the complainant has performed marriage with another person. During course of mediation offer was made by the side of the complainant for full and final settlement for Rs. 50,000/- and ornaments, which was not accepted by the petitioner.

6. Regard being had to the submission made by the parties, taking into consideration the nature of allegation made in the complaint and claim and counter claim between the parties, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Let the petitioner, above named, be released on



anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of four weeks from today on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (rupees ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of J.M. Ist, Araria in connection with Complaint Case No. 1012 / 2024 subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the B.N.S.S. 2023.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

praful/-

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

