

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33846 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1603 Year-2021 Thana- VAISALI COMPLAINT CASE  
District- Vaishali

=====

PANKAJ KUMAR VERMA S/O ASHOK KUMAR VERMA R/O Mohalla-  
Konharaghat, P.S- Nagar Hajipur, Distt.- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Neetu Verma @ Priya Srivastava R/O Mohalla- Konharaghat, in front Gali  
of Bidhut Sav Dah Grih, P.S- Nagar Hajipur, Distt.- Vaishali.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nageshwar Singh, Advocate  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Parmanand Prasad, A.P.P.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

- 4      20-11-2024                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned A.P.P. for the State.
2. No one appears on behalf of the opposite party  
no.2.
3. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case  
registered for the offence punishable under Section 498(A) of  
the Indian Penal Code.
4. From perusal of the order dated 25.09.2024, it  
manifests that on the said date also no one had appeared on  
behalf of the opposite party no. 2 which amply demonstrates  
that the learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 has lost  
interest in the case.
5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the



petitioner submits that petitioner being the husband has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the opposite party no. 2 on account of trivial dispute. It is further submitted that petitioner is willing to keep the opposite party no. 2 and the children with honour and dignity but then it appears that the opposite party no. 2 is not interested in reviving her conjugal relationship and is staying at her parental home along with her children. It is next submitted that petitioner is not allowed to meet the children but then submits that being husband, the petitioner is aware of his responsibility and is willing to pay a monthly maintenance of Rs.3,500/- to the opposite party no. 2 which shall commence from 01.12.2024. It is also submitted that petitioner is an auto driver.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner but then fairly submits that since petitioner is willing to pay a monthly maintenance of Rs.3,500/- to the opposite party no. 2, as such, no useful purpose would be served by sending him to jail.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on



anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Complaint Case No. 1603 of 2021, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

8. However, the opposite party no. 2 shall be at liberty to file an application seeking cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner, if the petitioner does not deposit the amount of maintenance as agreed for two consecutive months.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

Kundan/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

