

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.26743 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -1341 Year- 2013 Thana -KHAGARIA COMPALINT CASE District-
KHAGARIA

=====

Tara Devi Wife of Ramsihasan Prasad Verma, resident of Village- Bhadas,
P.S. Muffasil, District- Khagaria.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Pankaj Kumar Son of Sri Naseeb Prasad Singh @ Naseeb Singh, resident
of Village- Babu Chakala, P.S. Pusraha, District- Khagaria.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bishweshwar Ram

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Shailendra Kumar Singh

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR
SINGH**
ORAL ORDER

03/ 26-09-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

The present application has been filed for
cancellation of anticipatory bail of opposite party no. 2, Pankaj
Kumar, who being the husband of the daughter of the
complainant-petitioner, was granted anticipatory bail vide order
dated 05.04.2016 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 23707 of 2015 in
connection with Complaint Case No. 1341C of 2013, wherein
processes were directed to be issued after cognizance being taken
for the offences punishable under Sections 498A and 494 of the
Indian Penal Code, pending in the Court of learned SDJM,



Khagaria.

A supplementary affidavit was filed in the main petition to the effect that the issue was settled between the parties by way of payment of one time settlement amount. The petitioner claims that three drafts of Rs.13,000/-, 17,000/- and 20,000/- have been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner, who was opposite party in the earlier proceeding.

Learned counsel for the petitioner did not dispute the contention of learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 and made necessary endorsement on the record.

Keeping in view the fact that the statement was made on behalf of opposite party no. 2 on affidavit, which was not controverted by learned counsel for the petitioner, rather the payment was accepted, moreover, no statement has been made in the petition that till date any petition for modification of the aforesaid order has been filed, hence, on the said ground, this Court is not inclined to interfere.

Accordingly, the present application is dismissed.

(Dinesh Kumar Singh, J)

DKS/-

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

