

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.3660 of 2025

Sumit Kumar Mishra, S/o Suresh Kumar Mishra.

... ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. Sneha Poddar, D/o Dinesh Poddar.

... ... Opposite Parties

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Shailesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Shashi Kumar Verma, A.P.P.

04/ 11.07.2025

Heard the parties.

2. This anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been preferred by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Dhanbad Mahila P.S. Case No.05 of 2024, for offences under Sections 498-A, 494, 323, 417, 420, 504, 506 and 34 IPC and Sections 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. The case is presently pending before the Court of learned J.M. 1st Class, Dhanbad.
3. It is alleged by the prosecutrix in her written report that she met with the petitioner and both of them started living for some days. Thereafter they got married in a temple at Dhanbad. The prosecutrix alleged that after one month of the marriage, the petitioner started torturing her for demand of dowry. She alleged that on many occasions, the parents of the prosecutrix has given huge amount to the petitioner but the petitioner was not satisfied with the same and demanded more dowry.
4. The offences mentioned in the F.I.R. are punishable for a period of seven years or less.
5. In para-5 of this Anticipatory Bail Application, which is on oath, it has been stated that the petitioner is cooperating with the investigation as he has received Notice under Section 41A Cr.P.C. on 05.09.2024. It has been further stated in said para that the petitioner immediately went personally before Jaishree Minz, S.I.-cum-I.O., Mahila Thana, Dhanbad, to get his statement

recorded.

6. Learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that in presence of the said Investigating Officer, the petitioner gave his written reply which was also duly received by the Investigating Officer on 25.09.2024. Learned counsel thereafter adds that it is but natural that the petitioner has not been arrested as he is cooperating in the investigation.

7. Learned A.P.P. representing the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail.

8. Considering the admission of the petitioner that he has not been arrested in spite of the fact that he had gone and appeared before the Investigating Officer, which suggests that he is cooperating in the investigation, I am of the opinion that there is no apprehension of the petitioner being arrested by the Police. Thus, the petitioner should continue cooperating with the investigation by appearing before the Investigating Officer once in every fifteen days and in the meantime he should appear before the concerned Court who shall pass an appropriate order in terms with the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Satender Kumar Antil vs. Central Bureau of Investigation & Another***, reported in ***(2022) 10 SCC 51*** as well as ***Satender Kumar Antil vs. Central Bureau of Investigation & Another***, reported in ***(2024) 9 SCC 198*** and also taking into consideration the observation given in the said judgment.

9. In view of the aforesaid observations, this Anticipatory Bail Application stands **disposed of**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)