

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19912 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8 Year-2019 Thana- KATIHAR COMPLAINT CASE District-
Katihar

=====

Amod Mandal Son Of Late Khokha Mandal R/O Village- Bairiya, P.S.-
Tikapatti, District- Purnea Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Munni Devi Wife Of Amod Mandal R/O Village- Sabda, P.S.- Falka
(POTHIA), District- Purnea

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bimal Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pushpa Sinha, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 27-02-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

APP for the State along with learned counsel for the

Opposite Party No. 2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No. 08 of 2019, registered
for the offences punishable under Section 498(A) / 34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the Opposite Party No. 2
that the matter was referred for mediation where efforts
were made by the learned mediator to resolve the dispute. It
is next submitted that the petitioner initially agrees before
the learned mediator to settle the dispute by way of one time
settlement by paying an amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- (Five
Lakh) but later he stopped appearing before learned
mediator, which amply demonstrates that the petitioner



never had any intention of settling the dispute rather was only interested in seeking protection from this Court in the name of mediation. The said submission of the Opposite Party No. 2 is not disputed by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner rather concurs with the submission of the learned counsel for the Opposite Party No. 2 that petitioner stopped appearing before the learned mediator and in one of the proceedings he had agreed for resolving the dispute by way of one time settlement by paying an amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- (Five Lakh).

4. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the Opposite Party No. 2 and also taking into consideration the conduct of the petitioner in not appearing before the learned mediator, after obtaining interim protection from this Court. Further, the Court is not inclined to entertain the anticipatory bail application.

5. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail of the petitioner, is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

aditi/-

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

