

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.51982 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -59 Year- 2016 Thana -MAHILA PS District-
DARBHANGA

=====

Meenu Jha, W/o Sri Ashok Ranjan, R/o Gayatri Niwas
(Dyorhi), Mohalla- Shubhankarpur (New Colony),
Darbhanga, P.S.- Sadar, Darbhanga, District- Darbhanga.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

2. Alok Ranjan, S/o Sri Sunil Chandra Mishra, R/o Mohalla-
Anand Kutir, Veena Kunj, Ward No.19, P.S.- Sadar,
Madhubani, District- Madhubani (Bihar).

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prafull Chandra Jha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandrasen Pd. Singh, Adv.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI
SHARAN SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

2 17-01-2018

Heard the parties.

This application has been filed seeking
cancellation of bail granted to opposite party No. 2 by
virtue of order, dated 10.08.2017, passed in Cr. Misc. No.
52347 of 2016.

The petitioner is the wife of opposite party No.

2. The case arises out of Darbhanga Sadar Mahila P.S.



Case No. 59 of 2016, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498A, 504 and 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

It appears from the order, dated 10.08.2017, that opposite party No. 2 (petitioner in Cr. Misc. No. 52347 of 2016) had taken stand before this Court that he was ready to keep the complainant with full honour, love and dignity.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has, however, drawn my attention to a subsequent order, dated 23.08.2017, passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Darbhanga, to show that opposite party No. 2 has dedined to keep the petitioner with him without any valid reason.

I have perused the order, dated 23.08.2017, passed by the Principal Judge, Family Court, Darbhanga. It appears from the said order that the learned Principal Judge had undertaken an exercise to reconcile the dispute between the petitioner and opposite party No. 2. It also appears from the said order that the petitioner had made complaint against her mother-in-law, whereas, her husband, who is opposite party No. 2 herein, complained of the petitioner's behaviour being violent.



It has been noticed in the order, dated 10.08.2017, that the nature of dispute between the petitioner and opposite party No. 2 is matrimonial. In my view, no case for cancellation of anticipatory bail is made out.

This application has no merit and is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

Praveen-II/-

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

