

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Vaishali
A.B.P. No. 411/2026

Munna Thakur, aged about 35 years, S/o Shailendra Thakur,
Resident of village – Dih Agrail, P.S. - Baligaon, District – Vaishali.

- Petitioner

Verses

State of Bihar

- O.P.

Appearance :-

Learned counsel for the petitioner : - Sri. Rambabu Singh, advocate.

Learned P.P. for the State : - Sri Shyam Babu Rai,

Present : Harshit Singh,
Sessions Judge, Vaishali.

Date of order: - 16th April 2026

Heard the learned defence counsel as well as learned Public Prosecutor on the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the above named accused petitioner under section 482 of B.N.S.S. who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No. 4/2021 registered u/ss. 341, 342, 323, 307, 379, 498(A), 504 and 506 of I.P.C.

It is stated in Para 2 of the anticipatory bail petition that earlier no bail application either anticipatory or regular has been filed in the present case either before this court of Sessions or before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna.

The case of the prosecution in brief, as per complaint petition of Urmila Kumari that her marriage with the accused/petitioner was solemnized on 25/04/2024. Her parents gave ornaments, clothes, and covered barati expenses as per their capacity. She was tortured by her husband and in-laws for not fulfilling their demand for a motorcycle as dowry 2 months after the marriage. Attempts for compromise by her father and villagers was failed. She was driven out of her matrimonial home on 25/01/2025, and her belongings were snatched.

The learned counsel for the above named accused petitioner submits that the accused petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has falsely been implicated in this case. The entire prosecution case is false and concocted. Petitioner is husband of the informant. The accused petitioner has no criminal antecedent. Hence, a prayer has been made to allow this anticipatory bail petition.

(A.B.P. No.411/2026)
(Munna Thakur Vs. State of Bihar)

Present : Harshit Singh, Sessions Judge, Vaishali

Contd.

16.04.2026

The learned Public Prosecutor for the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

Heard both the parties and perused record. After perusal of the same, it transpires that the present case arises out of matrimonial dispute between husband/petitioner and wife/informant Nitu Kumari. The allegation relates to cruelty, demand of dowry. It is pertinent to mention that today both the petitioner/husband and informant/wife Nitu Kumari have appeared before this Court in person and have been identified by their respective counsels. The petitioner/husband has filed an application stating that the dispute between him and his wife has been amicably settled outside the Court with the intervention of family members and well-wishers. The present case is being purely a matrimonial dispute and now settled between husband and wife, no societal interest is involved. The purpose of criminal law in matrimonial cases is reformation and restoration of family, not punishment.

The petitioner has given an undertake that he will take his wife Nitu Kumari to his matrimonial home and will keep her with full dignity, care, and protection. He further undertakes not to subject her to any cruelty in future. The informant Nitu Kumari, on being questioned by the Court, has stated that she has settled all disputes with her husband. She has no grievance left against the petitioner and she is ready and willing to reside with him.

Therefore, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as nature of allegations, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the above named petitioner is hereby, allowed and it is ordered that in the event of arrest or surrender, he will be enlarged on anticipatory bail, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below, within four weeks of this order, subject to the conditions as laid down under section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita 2023. Subject to the further condition that:-

(A.B.P. No.411/2026)
(Munna Thakur Vs. State of Bihar)

Present : Harshit Singh, Sessions Judge, Vaishali

Contd.

16.04.2026

1. The petitioner shall take his wife to the matrimonial home and maintain her with dignity.
2. The petitioner, along with his wife, shall appear before the Ld. Trial Court in every month, for six months, and if, the wife complains any torture meted to her by the petitioner, the court will be at liberty to cancel bail bonds of the petitioner after due hearing.

(Dictated)

(Harshit Singh)
Sessions Judge, Vaishali