

In the Court of Dist. & Addl Sessions Judge-VI-cum-Spl. Judge, POCSO, Madhepura
ABP No.- 343/2026

(Arising out of Complaint Case P.S. Case No. 385/2024)

1

	Sandeep Kumar Saurabh, S/o- Rajendra Prasad Yadav, R/o- village- Bhagwan Mahavir Path, P.S. Jagdishpur, District- Bhagalpur. Petitioner Vs. State of Bihar O.P.	
17/06/26	An anticipatory bail petition has been filed on behalf of above named petitioner, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 385/2024 u/s- 115(2), 85, 316(2), 352, 351(2) (3) BNS & 4 DP Act, has been pressed today for hearing. Copy of petition already served to Id P.P. for state. Notice has been sent to the informant. Heard Sri Ramesh Shankar Vidhyarthi learned lawyer appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Id. P.P for the State and perused the case record. The prosecution case in brief is that the complainant filed a petition to this effect that her marriage has been solemnized on 25.06.2023 with Sandeep Kumar (petitioner). When she went to her sasural where her saas Kavita Devi, Nanad Anju Kumari, Suman Kumari and Shweta Kumari along with his husband Sandeep Kumar have started abusing the complainant. They started demanding dowry as Car, jewellery, furniture and fridge. Due to non-fulfillment of dowry they started torture with me. Her mother-in-law, and nanad Anju told that if you do not fulfill of these items then she has to gave us cash of Rs. 12 lacs. Her husband also demanded the land from her father and also demanded cash of Rs. 12 lacs. Her in-laws including her husband had tortured and marr-pit with complainant and fled from her sasural. Further alleged that on 22.05.2024 petitioner's husband had alleged the theft of ornaments worth of 25 lacs and cash of Rs. 2 lacs. The Id. Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is quite innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is submitted that there is contradiction statement of complainant and witnesses. There is no medical report to show that this petitioner has assaulted the complainant. Petitioner has got no criminal antecedents. The allegations made in the complaint are generic and non-specific. It is further submitted that private complaint witness is not they eye witness of the alleged occurrence. There is no chance of absconding or tampering with evidence so the	

17/06/26
Contd...

petitioner should be enlarged on bail.

Ld SPP during argument has opposed the prayer of this bail petition.

Heard both sides and perused the Complaint Case. This is a case of u/s-115(2), 85, 316(2), 352, 351(2) (3) BNS & 4 DP Act. Petitioner is the husband of complainant. There is specific allegation of demanding dowry of Rs. 12 lacs from the complainant's family against the petitioner. On being opposed by complainant, she has been abused and assaulted by the husband Sandeep Kumar Saurabh (petitioner) for non-fulfillment of dowry demand. After examination of witnesses as father and sister of complainant have supported the case of complainant thereafter, cognizance has also been taken against the petitioner. Considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, I do not find this is a fit case for Anticipatory bail. As such, I am not inclined to grant the accused petitioner namely, Sandeep Kumar Saurabh the privilege of anticipatory bail. Hence, the present Anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner stands, **rejected.**



Dictated

(Amit kumar Pandey)

Dist. & Addl Sessions Judge-VI
-cum-Spl. Judge, POCSO,
Madhepura