

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43553 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-616 Year-2016 Thana- MUNGER COMPLAINT CASE
District- Munger

=====

Shrawan Kumar @ Sharwan Kumar S/O Ramchandra Mandal R/O Village-
Shambhuganj, Dhor, P.S- Harpur, Distt.- Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ruchi Devi D/O Ram Vilas Prasad Singh, W/O Shrawan Kumar R/O Badi
Manjhagai, P.S- Gangta, Distt.- Munger.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jyoti Ranjan Jha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Abhay Kumar Roy

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 27-02-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned A.P.P. for the State along with learned counsel for the

OP No. 2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Complaint Case No. 616C/2016, dated 15-6-2016,
registered for the offences punishable under Section 498A of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel of the OP No. 2 submits that
the matter was referred for mediation, but then the mediation
failed. It is further submitted that at one stage in the mediation
proceeding, the petitioner had agreed for resolving the dispute
by way of one-time settlement. It is further submitted that the
petitioner has already performed his second marriage and also



has a child from the said wedlock.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the said submission of the learned counsel for the OP No. 2 that the petitioner had performed his second marriage and from the wedlock a child had been born. It is further submitted that the petitioner is not in a position to pay an amount of Rs. 6 lakhs, though the petitioner is willing to resolve the dispute by paying Rs. 1.5 lakhs by way of one-time settlement on which the learned counsel for the OP No. 2 submits that the petitioner has performed his second marriage and has a child and is maintaining the second wife but then does not have money to settle his first legally wedded wife.

5. Considering the submission made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the OP No. 2, the court is not inclined to entertain the anticipatory bail application, accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

