

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63063 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1314 Year-2022 Thana- WEST CHAMPARAN COMPLAINT
District- West Champaran

=====

MD. BAKAULLAH @ BAKAULLAH @ GUDDU S/O MD. SANAULLAH
R/O VILLAGE- BAGHI DEVRAJ, P.S- LAURIA, DISTT.- WEST
CHAMPARAN.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. RANGILA BEGUM D/O SABIR HUSSAIN, W/O BAKAULLAH @
GUDDU R/O VILLAGE- BAGHI DEVRAJ, P.S- LAURIA, DISTT.- WEST
CHAMPARAN AT PRESENT ADDRESS VILLAGE- DUMRA DEVRA,
P.S- LAURIA, DISTT.- WEST CHAMPARAN.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Preeti Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Akbar Ali, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 4 16-02-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P.

for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2.
2. Learned counsel for the parties jointly submitted that
interim report of the learned Mediator dated 07.02.2024 records that
the dispute between the parties is likely to be resolved but the time
given by the Hon'ble Court is going to expire in near future as such
extension of time was sought. It is further submitted by the learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no. 2 that the
petitioner never appeared before the learned Mediator in the
mediation proceeding. It is next submitted that the petitioner after
seeking interim protection left for Saudi Arabia where he works. It is
thus submitted that petitioner was only interested in obtaining stay
but was never genuinely interested in resolving the dispute.



3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner though disputes the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no. 2 but then fairly admits that petitioner never appeared before the learned Mediator and has left for Saudi Arabia.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that only interest of the petitioner was in obtaining an order of stay but was never genuinely interested in resolving the dispute. It is thus submitted that petitioner is not entitled for anticipatory bail.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. and also taking into consideration the conduct of the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to entertain the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner in connection with Complaint Case No. 1314 of 2022 pending in the Court of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Bettiah, West Champaran/successor Court.

6. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

