

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43289 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-54 Year-2024 Thana- EAST CHAMPARAN COMPLAINT
District- East Champaran

=====

Mohammad Faraz @ Mohammad Faraz Akhtar @ Faraz Akhtar son of Akhtar Hussain Resident of Ward no 51, Pathar Ki masjid, Dargah Road, PS -Sultan Ganj, Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Uzma Khurshid @ Ujma Khurshid Daughter of Khurshid Alam, W/o Mohammad Faraz @ Mohammad Faraz Akhtar @ Faraz Akhtar, R/o Mohalla – Agarwa, Ward No.35, P.S. - Motihari Sadar, Dist- East Champaran

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Nazia Shabah, Advocate.
For the State	:	Mr. Anand Kishore Choudhary, APP.
For O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Manish Dhari Singh, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 10-11-2025

Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner; learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has preferred the application under Section 528 of the BNSS for quashing the order dated 07.03.2024 passed in Complaint Case No. 54 of 2024 (INQ No. 10 of 2024) by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class cum Additional Munsif, Motihari whereby summons were directed to be issued against the accused persons for the offences under Sections 323, 341 and 498A of the Indian Penal Code and



Sections 3/4 of the D.P. Act.

3. The prosecution story, in brief, is that the Opposite Party No. 2 filed Complaint Case No. 54 of 2024 before the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class cum Additional Munsif, Motihari, alleging that her marriage with the petitioner, solemnized on 14.02.2020 according to Muslim rites and rituals. The parents of the opposite party no.2 gave jewellery worth Rs. 40,00,000/- and furniture worth Rs. 10,00,000 as dowry to the petitioner's family. It is further alleged that in 2023, the petitioner demanded Rs. 15,00,000 from the complainant, of which Rs. 10,00,000 was provided by her father to enable the petitioner to purchase land in Uttar Pradesh. Subsequently, the petitioner allegedly pressurized the complainant to demand additional money from her father to purchase a flat in New Delhi, which she refused, leading to her being brought back to Patna to reside with the petitioner's family. The complainant further alleges that the petitioner and his family mentally and physically harassed her, and on 26.11.2023 forcibly took her belongings and threw her out of the house. Being aggrieved, she approached the local police, but no FIR was lodged, following which, she filed the instant complaint. Upon examination of the complainant and witnesses, the learned Magistrate found a



prima facie case against the petitioner and took cognizance on 07.03.2024 for offences under Sections 498A, 323, 341 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, and thereafter issued summons against the petitioner on 08.04.2024.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the learned District Court, without considering the material available on record and applying its judicial mind has proceed to issue summons against the petitioner in most mechanical manner, which cannot sustain in the eye of law. Learned counsel further submitted that marriage is a sacred ceremony but little matrimonial skirmish suddenly erupts into hatred, in such circumstances, the Court must allow the parties to ponder so that they can reconcile their dispute outside the court. He further submitted that matter be referred for mediation.

5. Learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 and learned APP are also of the same view and jointly submitted that opportunity shall be given to the parties to reconcile their dispute amicably, as the offence is not against the society and need not encourage such dispute.

6. In such circumstances, the parties have agreed to



appear before the learned District Court at 10:30 A.M. on 27.11.2025 to resolve their dispute outside the court.

7. Heard the parties.

8. Having considered the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties. The parties have mutually agreed to appear on 27.11.2025 before the learned District Court. 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. In the present case, both the parties have agreed to settle the dispute outside the Court instead of fighting it out for which they have willingly agreed to appear before the learned District Court on 27.11.2025 at 10:30 AM.

11. Learned District Court is directed to take necessary steps to refer the matter before the learned Mediator of the District Mediation Center.

12. Learned Mediator of the District Mediation Center concerned shall make his/her best efforts to settle the dispute between the parties 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, 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 27.11.2025 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 present quashing application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

mantreshwar/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	17.11.2025
Transmission Date	17.11.2025

