

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25482 of 2016

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1687 Year-2015 Thana- SIWAN COMPLAINT CASE District-
Siwan

=====

Parmod Chaudhary @ Pramod Prasad son of Late Mohan Choudhary,
Resident of Village + P.O. Salemgarh, P.S.- Taraia Sujan, District-
Kushinagar, U.P.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. State of Bihar
2. Sandhya Devi, wife of Parmod Choudhary D/o Bishun Choudhary Resident
of village- Salemgarh, P.S. Taraia Sujan, District- Kushinagar U.P., At
present resident of village + Post- Lakari Dargah, P.S Barharia, District-
Siwan.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Ashok Kumar, Advocate.
For the State	:	Mr.Anant Kumar, APP.
For O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Bijay Prakash 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 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing the order dated 26.04.2016
passed in Complaint Case No. 1687 of 2015 by the learned
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Siwan whereby cognizance has
been taken under Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Prosecution story in brief, as revealed from the



complaint filed before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Siwan, in Complaint Case No. 1687 of 2015, is that the complainant was married to the petitioner, Pramod Choudhary, about twenty years ago. After marriage, she went to reside at her matrimonial home, where it is alleged that the petitioner demanded a sum of Rs. 50,000/- for the purpose of going abroad. It is further alleged that the complainant gave birth to two sons and two daughters. Despite this, the petitioner allegedly never visited her parental home and failed to provide any financial support or daily allowance for her maintenance.

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 taken cognizance 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.

6. The parties have agreed to appear before the learned District Court at 10:30 A.M. on 27.11.2025.

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 and they have willingly desired 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	12.11.2025
Transmission Date	12.11.2025

