

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63318 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-664 Year-2020 Thana- BEGUSARAI COMPLAINT CASE
District- Begusarai

MD. SAJJAD son of Md. Badruddin R/o- Kaidrabad W.no-4, Ps- bachhwara
Dist- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sultana Praween wife of Md. Sajjad, D/o- Md. Ajhar Village- Damodarpur
Ps- Bhagwanpur Dist- Begusarai

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Manoj Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Anita Kumari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 14-03-2024 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. 664C of 2020 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 498A, 323 and 504 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the relationship in between the petitioner and the OP No. 2 has
soured to an extent that it is not possible to revive the conjugal
relationship. It is next submitted that the case was referred for
mediation but then the mediation failed. It is next submitted that



petitioner is a poor person and thus is not in a position to maintain the OP No. 2.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the OP No. 2 submits that the relationship in between the petitioner and the OP No. 2 has reached a level where it is not possible to revive the conjugal relationship as the petitioner never took care of the OP No. 2 properly and even demanded dowry and for non-fulfillment of the same, assaulted her. It is further submitted that even OP No. 2 was willing to resolve the dispute by way of one-time settlement for Rs. 4 lakhs, but then the same was also denied by the petitioner which further goes to demonstrate that petitioner is not interested in either leaving the OP No. 2 or keeping her properly.

5. Considering the submission made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the OP No. 2, the court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

