

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46305 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-158 Year-2019 Thana- CIVIL LINE District- Gaya

VIKRAM PRATAP Son of Vinod Kumar Resident at Amar Niwas, Gurua Bazar, P.S.- Gurua, Distt - Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Surabhi Kumari wife of Vikram Pratap, D/o Vijay Kumar, C/o Jagdish Prasad, R/o Mohalla- Nadarganj, Pulpar, P.s.- Civil Lines, Gaya, Dsitriect-Gaya

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Arvind Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Md. Ataur Rahman, APP
For O. P. No. 2	:	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Priya Ranjan, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

4 15-10-2019 Pursuant to the order dated 26.09.2019 passed by this Court, both the parties along with their learned Advocates are present in Chambers.

The opposite party no. 2 has informed that in compliance of the order passed by this Court, the petitioner had visited her maike at Nawadih in the district of Bokaro in the State of Jharkhand on 6th October, 2019 and expressed his desire to take her back to the matrimonial home at Muzaffarpur where he would live with the opposite party no. 2 but the opposite party no. 2 expressed her desire that the petitioner should stay for two more days at Nawadih and thereafter, only she would accompany him. It is stated that the petitioner did not stop there



and returned back to his place.

The petitioner who is also present submits that he had gone to the maik of the opposite party no. 2 to bring her back, he was performing Navratra at his house and he wanted to bring her back to the matrimonial home but instead of accompanying him, the opposite party no. 2 asked him to stay for two days which he was not in a position to stay because of Puja going on at his place.

Both the parties have discussed their problems in presence of learned counsel from which it appears that the dispute between the parties arose out of their incompatibility over their respective job conditions. At this stage, once again the petitioner expressed his desire to take back opposite party no. 2 to the matrimonial home at Muzaffarpur, however, the opposite party no. 2 is not willing to go there because she is still apprehensive of her comfortable stay at Muzaffarpur.

Learned counsel of both the parties at one stage advised them to stay together at least for a week at Muzaffarpur to discuss their problems and to resolve the issues but ultimately it could not become possible.

In the given facts and circumstances of the case, the provisional bail granted to the petitioner by the learned co-



ordinate Bench on 26.07.2019 in connection with Gaya Civil
Linies P.S. Case No. 158 of 2019 is hereby confirmed. The
petitioner shall be allowed to continue on the previous bail
bond.

The application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

avin/-

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

