

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42453 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-26 Year-2021 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Patna

=====

Baban Sharma, S/O Adhik Sharma, R/O Village-Chata, Police Station-Tetiya
Bumber, District-Munger. At Present Tenant Of Raju South T.N Path P.S-
Kankarbagh, Patna Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar, Advocate
For the informant : Mr. Vijay Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Arun Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 10-02-2022 Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Let the defect (s) be removed within two weeks of the
complete start of the physical Court in normal course.

The petitioner, who is in custody since 03.04.2021,
seeks regular bail in connection with Patna Sadar Mahila P.S.
Case No. 26/2021, registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 498A, 504 and 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code and ³/₄
of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

Vide order dated 25.01.2022 a joint request was made
by Sri Sanjay Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner and Sri Satyendra Kumar, learned counsel appearing
on behalf of the informant that matter be adjourned so as to
allow the parties, who are husband and wife, to resolve their
matrimonial dispute amicably so that they can lead happy
conjugal life and can take proper care of their children.

Today, Sri Vijay Kumar Sinha, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that informant does not want settle the dispute, on any terms and conditions, with accused/petitioner.

Considering the allegation made against the petitioner as well as the apprehension of the informant that once the petitioner is released on bail, there is every likelihood that the petitioner will be threat to become the life of the informant and her two children, this court is not inclined to release the petitioner on regular bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail on behalf of the petitioner is hereby rejected. It is, however, made clear that any observation made in the order will not effect the trial on merits.

It is expected of the Court below to conclude the trial expeditiously within a period of nine months.

If the petitioner, so advised, may renew his prayer for bail after nine months, if no substantial progress takes place in the trial.

Accordingly, the present application is disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

ravishankar/-

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