

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76968 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1202 Year-2017 Thana- NAWADAH COMPLAINT CASE
District- Nawada

=====

Sitaram Chauhan, Son of Chauthi Chauhan, Resident of Village- Maheshpur,
P.S. Kashichak, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sangeeta Kumari, D/o Tulshi Prasad @ Tulshi Chauhan, Resident of
Village- Mahdeba, P.O. P.S.- Hiusa, District- Nawada.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sudhir Kumar Sinha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sri Uday Chand Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

7 28-08-2019 This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail in

connection with Complaint Case No. 1202 of 2017, disclosing

offences under Sections 498A of the Indian Penal Code and

Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

Allegation is of demand of Rs.2,00,000/- and one
motorcycle from the complainant, due to non-fulfillment, she
was ousted from the house. Further, he has also married with
another lady.

On the assertion of the learned counsel for the
petitioner is that he is ready to keep her with dignity and care,
the matter was referred to the Patna High Court Mediation and
Reconciliation Center, but it appears that due to his non-
appearance the mediation failed.



Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the whole allegation is false and concocted. He has no criminal antecedent.

Heard learned A.P.P. also who has opposed the prayer for bail stating that not only there is allegation of demand but he has solemnized the second marriage with another lady and conduct of the petitioner will appear at one side, he is ready to keep her, but not co-operated in the Case is under Section 498A of IPC.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that as a matter of fact, the opposite party no.2 has illicit relationship with one Manoj Kumar and that is why she is not ready to reside with the petitioner and they are reside at Delhi. However, he is still ready to keep her, but she refused to reside with the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 has submitted that she is also ready to reside with the petitioner.

In such view of the matter, let the matter be referred to the Patna High Court Mediation and Reconciliation Center.

Both the parties to appear before the mediation center on 15.07.2019 and the Mediator to submit a report to this Court



by 06.09.2019.

Having heard both sides, in view of the facts and circumstances, as stated above, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, however, the petitioner may move before the learned court below for regular bail which will be considered by the learned court below.

With the aforesaid, this application is dismissed.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

Sunil Shukla/-

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

