

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.32632 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -318 Year- 2014 Thana -AURANGABAD COMPLAINT CASE
District- AURANGABAD

=====

Pramod Kumar Son of Uday Prasad Verma@uday Prasad resident of
Village Morarpur,(Biharsharif), P.s Laheri, District Nalanda at Biharsharif

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Smt. Madhu Soni@Arti Soni W/o Pramod kumar, D/o Gopa Prasad
resident of Village Morarpur (Bihar Sharif) P.s Laheri , District Nalanda at
Present resident of Village Rafiganj(Mohalla -Maharajganj P.O and P.s
Rafiganj District Aurangabad)

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pankaj Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 02-12-2015 The matter has been listed under the heading “ Order on
Office Notes”.

It appears that after receipt of notice by the father of
the opposite party no. 2, she has appeared in person before this
court and therefore, this case can be heard as the petitioner is also
present in Court today.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the Opposite party No. 2.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Complaint Case No. 318 of 2014 registered for the offences
punishable under Section 498(A) of the Indian Penal Code.

After much deliberations, it has transpired that the petitioner is absolutely recalcitrant not to live with the opposite party no. 2 whereas; opposite party no. 2 is eager and desirous to live with her husband alongwith her baby child. It has been suggested by this Court that till the opposite party no. 2 is able to build her confidence on her husband, the petitioner may visit and meet with opposite party no. 2 alongwith her child but the petitioner is adamant not to go there, at all.

Under such circumstances, it appears that petitioner has no intention to reconcile and resolve the issue.

In the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is constrained to withdraw the interim protection passed in favour of the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Anjana Mishra, J)

Jagdish/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--