

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.85696 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-87 Year-2024 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - DEHRI-ON-SONE
District- Rohtas

=====

Taslim Arif @ Taslim Aarif S/o Jahangir Ansari Resident of Village - Amari,
P.O - Karwandiya, P.S - Sasaram (M), District - Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rubi Khatoon W/o Taslim Arif D/o Late Azmer Ansari, R/o Village - Saraiya, P.S - Amjhor, District - Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Siddharth Harsh
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Sanjay Kumar Tiwary

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 23-04-2026 1. Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 87 of 2024 registered under Section 498A, 406, 323, 341, 504, 506 / 34 of the I.P.C. and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per the complaint petition the marriage of the complainant was performed with the petitioner on 09.07.2023. It is alleged that after two months of her marriage, the petitioner along with other family members started demanding Rs. 2,00,000 /- as dowry and due to non fulfillment of the demand of dowry lastly ousted her from matrimonial home.

4. Mr. Siddharth Harsh, learned counsel for the petitioner



submits that petitioner has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. The complainant does not want to live in her matrimonial home at village Amari and she always forced the petitioner to be separate from his parents and to take house on rent at Sasaram. The petitioner and his family members never demanded any dowry either in kind and / or cash. After complainant left the matrimonial home on 22.11.2023 settlement was reached at between the parties in presence of well wishers of both the parties and it was decided that the petitioner side would return the goods and money offered / gifted in the marriage to the complainant side and thereafter both the parties agreed for divorce. The petitioner side has already returned the things as per agreement but thereafter the present case has been lodged on the basis of concocted story.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant / opposite party no. 2 vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the matter was referred for mediation vide order dated 20.03.2026 but despite sincere efforts of the learned Mediator the mediation failed (mediation report- flag 'M') and complainant came to know that the petitioner has performed second marriage.

6. Regard being had to the submission made by the parties,



taking into consideration the fact that petitioner constantly harassed the complainant due to non fulfillment of demand of dowry and during subsistence of first marriage the petitioner performed second marriage which amounts to giving mental torture to the complainant, accordingly, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The same is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

praful/-

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

