

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34892 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-271 Year-2014 Thana- MAJORGANJ District- Sitamarhi

Krishna Murari Jha @ Krishna Murari S/O Mahendra Jha Resident of Village-
Barharwa, P.S.- Majorganj, Dist- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Hema Jha D/O Samrendra Kumar Jha R/O Village- Dhadhi, P.S- Nanpur,
Distt.- Sitamarhi.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Ashok Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Mohammed Arif, APP
For the O.P. No.2	:	Ms. Anjani Kumar Jha, Advocate
		Ms. Anita Kumari Sharma, Advocate
		Mr. Vishwa Shri Rajendra, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 04-12-2025

Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner; learned counsel appearing on behalf of the O.P. No.2
and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has preferred the application under
Section 482 Cr.P.C. / 528 BNSS for quashing of the order dated
05.12.2024 passed in connection with Trial No.1319 of 2024
arising out of Majorganj (Suppi) P.S. Case No.271 of 2014 by
the learned Judicial Magistrate- Ist Class, Sitamarhi, whereby
cognizance has been taken under Sections 494, 497, 498A of the
IPC.

3. The prosecution story, in short is that marriage of



the informant/O.P. No.2 was solemnized with petitioner on 27.06.2007. The petitioner (husband), his married sister, and other family members started demanding dowry from the O.P. No.2, and when she protested, she was subjected to continuous mental and physical torture due to non-fulfilment of demand of dowry. The petitioner filed Matrimonial Case No. 65/2008 and that the harassment continued to such an extent that O.P. No.2 became mentally unstable. Aggrieved by the said act, the O.P. No.2 has filed the FIR bearing Majorganj (Suppi) P.S. Case No.271 of 2014.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the learned District Court before taking cognizance of the offence failed to consider that the offence as alleged is not against the society. He further submitted that even considering the offence as alleged, materials available on record don't disclose any criminal element and without considering this aspect, the order taking cognizance against the petitioner becomes unsustainable in the eye of law. Learned counsel submitted that the petitioner is a government teacher and he is ready to pay Rs.25 lakhs immediately. Learned counsel further submitted that marriage is a sacred ceremony but little matrimonial skirmish suddenly erupts into hatred but



the same can be resolved, if the parties are given opportunity to ponder to reconcile their dispute outside the court.

5. *Per contra*, learned APP appearing on behalf of the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the O.P. No.2 submitted that a chance be given to the parties for amicable settlement outside the court.

6. The petitioner's counsel on instruction submitted that the petitioner has agreed to appear before the learned District Court at 10:30 A.M. on 17.12.2025.

7. Heard the parties.

8. Having considered the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties, as well as, the fact that the matrimonial dispute is not an offense against the society rather a matrimonial dispute is a private conflict between spouses and does not inherently constitute an offence against society. However, a false case can have a disastrous consequence in absence of any criminal content. The personal dispute cannot call for a criminal offence. In such situation, continuation of the proceeding would amount to abuse of process of law leading to vexatious proceeding against the petitioner.

9. In this regard, the Apex Court in the case of **B.S. Joshi v. State of Haryana**, reported in, **(2003) 4 SCC 675**, in



paragraph nos. 12 and 13 has held as under:-

“ 12. The special features in such matrimonial matters are evident. It becomes the duty of the court to encourage genuine settlements of matrimonial disputes.

*13. The observations made by this Court, though in a slightly different context, in **G.V. Rao v. L.H.V. Prasad [(2000) 3 SCC 693 : 2000 SCC (Cri) 733]** are very apt for determining the approach required to be kept in view in a matrimonial dispute by the courts. It was said that there has been an outburst of matrimonial disputes in recent times. Marriage is a sacred ceremony, the main purpose of which is to enable the young couple to settle down in life and live peacefully. But little matrimonial skirmishes suddenly erupt which often assume serious proportions resulting in commission of heinous crimes in which elders of the family are also involved with the result that those who could have counselled and brought about rapprochement are rendered helpless on their being arrayed as accused in the criminal case. There are many other reasons which need not be mentioned here for not encouraging matrimonial litigation so that the parties may ponder over their defaults and terminate their disputes amicably by mutual agreement instead of fighting it out in a court of law where it takes years and years to conclude and in that process the parties lose their “young” days in chasing their “cases” in different courts.*

10. The dispute between the parties is purely civil in nature and the petitioner has willingly desired to pay Rs.25 Lakhs immediately and to appear before the learned District Court on 17.12.2025 at 10:30 AM, so that the matter can be referred to the District Mediation Centre.

11. Learned District Court is directed to take



necessary steps to refer the matter before the learned Mediator of the District Mediation Center after summoning O.P. No.2 by fixing a date for appearance.

12. Learned Mediator of the District Mediation Center concerned upon appearance of the parties on the fixed date shall make his/her best efforts to settle the dispute amicably and thereafter submit his/her report before the concerned learned District Court, well within a period of four months, till then, no coercive action shall be taken against the petitioner in connection with the aforesaid case.

13. In case, the parties resolve their dispute amicably, or arrive at a mutual settlement then the proceeding is required to be dropped in light of the law laid down by the Apex Court as referred hereinabove.

14. In case of failure on the part of the petitioner to appear on 17.12.2025 before the learned District Court or any date fixed by the learned Mediator, the interim protection granted to the petitioner shall automatically lose its force.

15. In case, it is deliberate on the part of the petitioner and he fails to reconcile, then in that case, the learned District Court shall proceed with the trial. In case, it is deliberate on the part of the opposite party no.2 to reconcile, then in that case,



the interim protection granted to the petitioner shall continue and the trial shall proceed in accordance with law.

16. Accordingly, the order taking cognizance is modified to the above extent.

17. The application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Ashishsingh/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	09.12.2025
Transmission Date	09.12.2025

