

In the court of Mahesh Kumar, District & Additional Sessions Judge-1st,
-cum- Special Judge, SC/ST Sheohar
A.B.P. Case No. 29/2026
Complain Case No. 59/2021
Md. Saddam Vs. State of Bihar

ORDER

11.03.2026

The anticipatory bail petition dated 21.01.2026 has been filed on behalf of the petitioner namely **Md. Saddam**, in connection with Complain Case No. 59/2021 registered for the offence u/s 323, 498(A) and 504/34 of I.P.C, and the same has been put today for the order.

The prosecution story in brief is that the the complainant Sahida Khatoon stated in her complainant that her marriage was solemnized with Md. Saddam 6 years ago according to Muslim rites and rituals. In this marriage, her father has given Rs. One lac fifty thousand in cash and Rs. One lac spent on furniture and T.V. She gave birth two child after marriage. After some time the petitioner started to demand a pulsar bike as dowry. Then she filed a case in Sheohar Mahila P.S. Case No. 04/2020. On 10.02.2021 at 09:00 AM petitioner / accused person again stated to demand two lack rupees for business. When she refused to do so, all the accused persons beaten her and used to say that she has to bring the said money from her father. Lastly they drove out the complainant from her matrimonial home.

A The Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner is innocent and he has committed no offence whatsoever as alleged. It is further submitted that the complaint petition as alleged is false, frivolous, baseless and concocted. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and the petitioner is quite innocent. He is ready to keep his wife. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case.

The Ld. Additional Special P.P. on behalf of the complainant have opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for stated that the petitioner is the husband of the informant and he is not ready to keep his wife, but the informant (wife) wants to live with the petitioner. The petitioner not only failed to perform his duty but he also started to demand dowry from the complainant and when the complainant opposed the demand of petitioner then the petitioner started to torture her and lastly he drove out the complainant from her matrimonial house.

Heard both the parties and perused the record.

In the court of Mahesh Kumar, District & Additional Sessions Judge-1st,
-cum- Special Judge, SC/ST Sheohar
A.B.P. Case No. 29/2026
Complain Case No. 59/2021
Md. Saddam Vs. State of Bihar

After perusal of the FIR, it is clear that the case has been instituted u/s 323, 498(A) and 504/34 of I.P.C. From the perusal of the case record it appears that the petitioner is the husband of the complainant and he is not ready to keep his wife, but the complainant (wife) wants to live with the petitioner (husband). It appears that the accused petitioner is the husband of the complainant being the husband, it is his responsibility and liability to keep his wife with full dignity and care. But the petitioner has failed to perform the same. The petitioner not only failed to perform his duty but he also started to demand dowry from the complainant and when the complainant opposed the demand of petitioner then the petitioner started to torture her and lastly he drove out the complainant from her matrimonial house. The court tried to settle the dispute between the parties by mediation but due to non cooperation of the parties the hectic effort of the court went in vein.

Thus, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of allegation as brought against the petitioner. I do not think it proper to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner namely, **Md. Saddam** dated 21.01.2026 is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated)

Mahesh Kumar

District & Additional Sessions Judge-1st,
-cum- Special Judge SC/ST, Sheohar
11.03.2026