

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA  
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14903 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-237 Year-2018 Thana- WARISNAGAR District- Samastipur

RAJAN SAHNI @ RAJAN KUMAR Son of Budhan Sahni Resident of  
Village - Rouha Pachimi, P.S.- Warisnagar, Distt - Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                            |                               |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s :     | Mr. Priyanka Kumari, Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party/s : | Mr. Sangeeta Sharma, APP      |
|                            | Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate    |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD  
ORAL ORDER**

7      06-09-2019                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State.

Petitioner in the present case is seeking anticipatory bail in connection with Warisnagar P.S. Case No.237 of 2018 registered for the offence under Sections 323, 341, 342, 494, 498A and 504/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Samastipur.

By order dated 12.03.2019, at the instance of learned counsel for the petitioner saying that the petitioner is looking for a settlement with opposite party no. 2, the matter was referred to Mediation Centre attached to this court, so that efforts may be made to find out an amicable settlement between the parties.



It appears that from the report received from the Mediation Centre that neither the parties nor their learned counsel appeared before the Mediator on 20.06.2019, 26.06.2019 and 08.07.2019, hence the mediation failed. Thereafter taking note of the stand of the opposite party no. 2 that she is looking for some maintenance at least at this stage, the matter was adjourned at the instance of learned counsel for the petitioner who prayed for some time to seek instruction.

Thereafter, when the matter was taken up on 16.08.2019 a submission was made that the opposite party no. 2 has solemnized marriage with someone else. This court granted time to the petitioner to enable him to produce some cogent evidence to believe his submission.

Today, learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to show that opposite party no. 2 has solemnized marriage, at the same time he is not coming out with any instruction to provide some maintenance to opposite party no. 2. Therefore, in such circumstance, where he is not ready to keep the opposite party no. 2, and at the same time, taking note of his shifting stand and non-cooperation in the settlement of the disputes as also the gravity of the allegations made against him whereunder he is said to have been driven out the opposite party no. 2 from her



matrimonial home, this court is not willing to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

**(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)**

Avin/Rajeev-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

