

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52070 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8597 Year-2013 Thana- BEGUSARAI COMPLAINT CASE
District- Begusarai

=====

Madan Paswan S/o Sahdev Paswan R/o Village-Bank, P.S.- Dandari, District-
Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Rani Devi W/o Madan Paswan R/o Village-Bank, P.S.- Dandari, District-
Begusarai, At present D/o Bhola Paswan, R/o Village- Parihara, P.S.- Bakhri
(Parihara), District- Begusarai

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Anshu Dhar Sharma, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr.Surendra Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Randhir Kumar, Adv.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

8 09-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as

learned APP for the State.

2. In this case, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in
connection with Complaint P.S. Case No. 8597C of 2013,
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 498A, 323
34 of the IPC and Section 4 of DP Act.

3. The complainant filed complaint against the
petitioner, stating therein that her marriage was solemnized with
the petitioner according to Hindu rituals and customs. When she
went to her matrimonial house, she spent some peaceful days, but
thereafter the petitioner and other accused persons started torturing
her for demand of dowry. Lastly, she was ousted from her
matrimonial house.

4. Vide Order dated 31-07-2024, the petitioner was



granted provisional bail till 26-09-2024 for exploring the possibility of amicable resolution between the parties. Vide Order dated 26-09-2024, the matter was referred to the Patna High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre and in that order, it was also observed that the petitioner shall make payment of Rs 3,000 per month to his wife, the complainant. Thereafter, the petitioner made allegations against his wife that she had solemnized her second marriage, and was therefore not entitled for the maintenance as directed by this Court.

5. The Superintendent of Police, Begusarai was directed to inquire into the matter, whether his wife had solemnized her second marriage or not. It was reported by the Superintendent of Police that she had not solemnized her second marriage. In the same report, it has been mentioned that the petitioner himself had solemnized his second marriage.

6. Under the above-mentioned fact and circumstances, the petitioner does not deserve the privileges for bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

kundan/-

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

