

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.56523 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-26 Year-2023 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Buxar

=====

UPENDRA MAURYA @UPENDRA KUMAR MAURYA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nand Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

4 27-02-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Buxar (Mahila) P.S. Case No. 26 of 2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 498(A), 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. As per allegation, the marriage of the petitioner was solemnized with opposite party no. 2 on 03.05.2019 under Hindu Rites and Rituals. It is further alleged that soon after the marriage, she was subjected to demand of dowry and torture in various ways, however, the couple was blessed with a daughter but despite this fact, they continued with the torture and finally, ousted the opposite party no. 2 from her matrimonial home.

4. By order dated 08.11.2023, both parties were directed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court to appear before Patna High



Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre on 30.11.2023, but the petitioner was not present before Patna High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre.

5. The report of learned Mediator shows that on 30.11.2023, 08.12.2023 and 04.01.2024, dates were fixed for appearance of both the parties before the mediation center. Though the opposite party no. 2 and her counsel appeared on the aforesaid dates, but the petitioner and his counsel failed to appear on the aforesaid dates, which shows the apathy of the petitioner. Even the petitioner did not inform his wife that he was not coming to Patna to attend the process of mediation. The wife is running from pillar to the post due to act of the petitioner.

6. The conduct of the petitioner does not appear to be fair and his intimation is only to harass the victim.

7. In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege for anticipatory bail which is, hereby, rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/-

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

