

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.83150 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-34 Year-2023 Thana- NADI District- Supaul

=====

Anand Kumar Kamat S/o Jibachh Kamat R/o village-Kyotapatti, Ward No.1,
P.S-Supaul Nadi Thana, (Barhara), District-Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Sushila Kumari D/o Sri Kari Kamat, W/o Anand Kumar Kamat R/o village-Kyotapatti, Ward No.1, P.S-Supaul Nadi Thana (Barhara), District-Supaul.
At present-R/ovillage-Lalmaniya, Ward no.12, P.O-Lalpur, P.S-Supaul Nadi Thana, District-Supaul

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP
Mr. Ranjay Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 23-04-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP

for the State along with learned counsel appearing on behalf of

the O.P. No.2.

2. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the O.P.

No.2 submits that despite best effort of the learned mediator to
resolve the dispute, the dispute could not be settled on account
of adamant attitude of the petitioner as he was neither willing to
pay any maintenance nor was willing to resolve the dispute by
way of one time settlement.

3. The learned counsel further submits that O.P. No.2

for the last nearly one year is residing separately from the
petitioner and is residing at her parental home without any



financial support from the petitioner, thus submits that one can well imagine the plight of the O.P. No.2 that she has to depend on her parents for each and everything, when it was the duty of the petitioner to ensure the well being of the O.P. No.2. It is also submitted that O.P. No.2 was willing to resolve the dispute and even was ready to accompany the petitioner to her matrimonial home, but then the petitioner was completely adamant not to resolve the dispute.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the O.P. No.2.

5. In view of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the O.P. No.2, the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Prakash Narayan

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

