IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73241 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011019092026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-703 Year-2019 Thana- MUNGER COMPLAINT CASE District- Munger

==========

Rohit Kumar @ Rohit Kumar Singh @ Munna S/o Late Baikunth Singh R/o Village - Dhodhani, P.S - Parsauni, District - Sitamarhi at present Bagmati Circle Colony, Ward No. O, Dumra, Sitamarhi

... ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rubi Kumari W/o Rohit Kumar Singh @ Munna D/o Late Bhaso Prasad Yadav, R/o Village - Mirchi Talab, P.S - Kotwali, District - Munger

... ... Opposite Parties

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner : Mr. Devendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party-State: Mr. Shantanu Kumar, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEEN KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
Date : 20-11-2026

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is seeking quashing of the order dated 06.01.2020 passed by the learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Munger, in Complaint Case No. 703C of 2019, whereby and whereunder cognizance has been taken against the petitioner for the offence under Section 498A of the IPC and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that allegedly the petitioner, who was working as Clerk in Water Drainage Division, Sitamarhi, used to frequently visit the complainant's house in Munger along with complainant's brother-in-law and subsequently

WEB COPY

the petitioner and complainant started loving each other. It is further alleged that, upon coming to know about their affair, the family members of the complainant restricted the petitioner from visiting their house because the petitioner belonged to different caste. However, on being persuaded by the petitioner, the family members of the complainant agreed for the marriage and their marriage was solemnized at complainant's house at Munger on 12.06.2019 according to Hindu rites and rituals. It is further alleged that after marriage, the petitioner left the complainant's house on the pretext of joining his duty with an assurance that he will come back after 3-4 days and take her to his house at Sitamarhi after convincing his family members and the petitioner also said that his family members were demanding Rs.10 lakhs as dowry, which he will get reduced, even though the petitioner was given clothings, gold chain and ring of his choice. It is further alleged that when the petitioner did not come back, the complainant tried to call him on telephone, but her number was blocked and thereafter the complainant along with her family members went to Sitamarhi, where they were abused and assaulted by the petitioner and his family members and were told that since the petitioner is in Government service, they will have to pay Rs. Ten lakhs as dowry. It is further alleged that though the

WEB COPY

complainant and her family members stayed at Sitamarhi for 6-7 days and tried to contact the petitioner, but he was not found at his office and the petitioner along with his family also went away after locking the quarter. It is also alleged that when the complainant went to Parsauni P.S. for lodging complain, she was told to lodge it at Munger since the occurrence took place at Munger.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner, being the husband, has falsely been implicated in this case. Moreover, the petitioner was not aware of the present case pending against him.

5. Upon query, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the process under Section 82 Cr.P.C. has been issued in June, 2026 and the present allegation against the petitioner is malicious and vexatious one.

6. Learned counsel for the State opposed the prayer of the petitioner.

7. Heard the parties and perused the record.

8. The petitioner has challenged the order taking cognizance of the year 2020, in the year 2026, instead of challenging the order of issuance of proclamation under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. Even on merits, there is specific allegation against

WEB COPY

the petitioner and the learned court below has found that a *prima facie* case is made out against him.

9. In above view of the matter as well as specific allegation against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter. This application is accordingly dismissed.

(Praveen Kumar, J)

Pawan/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Date of Pronouncement	20.11.2026.
Uploading Date	20.11.2026.
Transmission Date	20.11.2026.

WEB COPY