

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.1010 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-1111 Thana- District-

Wasi Ahmad @ Guddu S/o Md. Illiyas @ Baddi , R/o Vill.- Bela Sakhuwa,
Ward No. 6, P.S.- Tribeniganj, District- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Nasarin Khatoon W/o Vashi Ahmad @ Gudu , R/o Vill.- Sakhuwa Ward No. 06, P.S.- Tribeniganj, District- Supaul at present address residing at Nasarin Khatoon, D/o Md. Yakub Khan, R/o Jhiwara, East Fulkahi, Ward No. 07, P.S.- Samraha, District- Araria.
3. Najani Khatoon Minor Daughter, through legal guardian Nasarin Khatoon, Mother, Resident at Present Jhirwa, East Fulkahi, Ward No. 7, P.S. Simraha, District Araria

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr.
For the State	:	Mr. Akhileshwar Dayal, APP
For the OP. No. 2, 3	:	Mr. Amar Nath Yadav, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

58 26-07-2022

No one appears for the petitioner.

On the last date, the matter was adjourned on the request of learned counsel for the petitioner.

The revision application has been filed against the impugned judgment dated 8th February, 2016 by which the learned court below has directed the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- to the O.P. No. 2 and a sum of Rs.1,500/- to the O.P. No. 3. They are the wife and the minor daughter respectively of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for O.P. Nos. 2 and 3 is present. It is submitted that the petitioner was earlier arrested in connection



with Miscellaneous Case No. 08 of 2017 but he has been released by the order dated 25.05.2019 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Supaul.

This Court has perused the order dated 25.05.2019. It appears from the said order that the opposite party no. 2 had brought a miscellaneous case under Section 128 Cr.P.C. causing enforcement of the impugned order and in connection with that the petitioner was arrested then it was revealed that the opposite party no. 2 has entered into a settlement with her husband after taking divorce and she had received a lumpsum amount of Rs.1,45,000/- towards her Iddat expenses, gifts and mehar.

Be that as it may, since no one appears on behalf of the petitioner to press this application, it is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

SUSHMA2/-

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

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

