

IN THE COURT OF 01st DISTRICT & ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE

ROHTAS AT SASARAM

ANTICIPATORY BAIL PETITION NO. 60 of 2026

Arising out of Mahila P.S. Case No. 13 of 2025

Under section 109, 118(2), 115(2), 85, 351(2), 303(2),127(2), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 & 3,4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act,1961

IN THE MATTER OF:-

Deepak Verma, Aged about 33 years,

S/o- Sheoshankar Verma

R/o Village :- Nokha Mujradh, P.S. Nokha District - Rohtas

..... Petitioner.
Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party.

For the Petitioner : Mr. Anil Kumar Chaurasia, Ld. Advocate.

For the O. P. (State) : Mr. Upendra Kumar, Ld. P.P.

ORDER

23.03.2026 This **pre-arrest bail** has been preferred u/s 482 of Bharatiya Suraksha Nagrik Sanhita, 2023 (438 Cr.P.C.) on behalf of the above noted accused apprehension of arrest in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No. 13 of 2025 for the offence under section 109, 118(2), 115(2), 85, 351(2), 303(2),127(2), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 & 3,4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act,1961. The parties have already been heard. The matter is posted today for order. The order follows:-

The learned counsel for petitioner / accused reading out the contents of F.I.R., has submitted that the petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence and he has falsely been implicated in this false case only to pressurize the petitioner on instruction of family member of the informant and no occurrence took place like stated in the F.I.R. and prosecution story is false and absurd. He further added that petitioner is the husband of the informant and is ready to keep his wife Joti Priya Jhunjhunwala with full respect and dignity and after several attempts were made by the petitioner for bidai of the informant but she is not ready to live with the petitioner and the informant herself ousted the house of the petitioner and the petitioner never tortured the informant nor demanded any dowry from any one. He further submitted that there is no application under section 109,118(2) and 85 of the B.N.S. only family dispute the informant filed this false case against the petitioner and all family along with house owner family member and an F.I.R. has been lodged as part of a well planned conspiracy, with full preparation by the informant after perusal of computer typed application and the petitioner is ready to furnish bail bond and sureties to the satisfaction of your honour's court and prayed to enlarge the petitioner on pre-arrest bail.

IN THE COURT OF 01st DISTRICT & ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE

ROHTAS AT SASARAM

ANTICIPATORY BAIL PETITION NO. 60 of 2026

Arising out of Mahila P.S. Case No. 13 of 2025

Under section 109, 118(2), 115(2), 85, 351(2), 303(2),127(2), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 & 3,4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act,1961

Continued...

23.03.2026

Per contra, the Ld. P.P appearing for the State has opposed the prayer for pre- arrest bail submitting that the allegation is direct against the accused / petitioner and serious in nature. Hence, prayed to reject it.

After giving due attention to the averments of the parties, it goes to appear from the record that the case has been filed under section 109, 118(2), 115(2), 85, 351(2), 303(2),127(2), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 & under section 3,4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act,1961 against the petitioner including others. During the course of hearing before this Court, this Court did notice that the petitioner / accused facing charge of ill-treatment against his wife because of being allegedly indulged in illegal relationship with another girl. Further more, the petitioner is a husband of victim and main accused of the matter and the matter was also sent for mediation under the umbrella of District Legal & Services Authority, Rohtas at Sasaram but it went in vain. No effort has been made, on the part of the petitioner to revive the nuptial life. Considering, the whole issue in totality, it does not appear to be fit case of anticipatory bail, in the given context of the matter. Accordingly, **the pre-arrest bail is refused with a direction to surrender before the Trial Court within a period of four weeks from the date of this order** and pray for regular bail, however, the Court in seisin of the record will not be prejudiced with the opinion so arrived at, in this order, at the time of hearing of regular bail application of the applicant, if the occasion as such arises, and will act in accordance with law.

(Dictated)

(Illegible)

(Pankaj Mishra)

1st District & Additional Sessions Judge,
Rohtas at Sasaram
23.03.2026

Date of judgement/order	23.03.2026
Date of reserving judgment/order	16.03.2026
Uploading date	24.03.2026
Uploaded by	Prabhash Kr.