

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67847 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-426 Year-2019 Thana- JAYNAGAR District- Madhubani

-
1. Manish Kumar Singh Son of Late Upendra Prasad Singh R/O Archana Bihar, Gali No.- 01, Suhud Nagar, P.S.- Begusarai, District - Begusarai
 2. Manju Singh Wife of Late Upendra Prasad Singh R/O Archana Bihar, Gali No.- 01, Suhud Nagar, P.S.- Begusarai, District - Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Arun Kumar Singh Son of Late Ramphal Singh R/O Road No.- 02, Shivpuri Colony, Katari Hill Road, P.S.- Chandauti, District - Gaya

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mrs. Rina Sinha, Advocate
For the O.P. No. 2	:	Mr. Suman Kumar Mishra, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Syed Mojibur Rahman, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 09-10-2025 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners; learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 and learned APP for the State.

2. The present application has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of the order dated 13.07.2020 passed in Jainagar P.S. Case No. 426 of 2019 by the learned S.D.J.M., Madhubani, whereby cognizance has been taken under Sections 419, 420 and 498A/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The allegation is of subjecting the opposite party no.2 to various sorts of torture due to non-fulfillment of the demand of the dowry.



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submitted that the learned District Court, in the most mechanical manner, without applying his judicial mind that the matter is purely civil in nature and without considering the material available on record, has taken cognizance of the offence under Sections 419, 420 and 498A/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 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 and the parties can be allowed to ponder to 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 jointly submitted that opportunity shall be given to the parties to reconcile their dispute amicably.

6. Heard the parties.

7. Having considered the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties, I find that the parties have failed to settle the matrimonial dispute, however, the Court till last minute must strive to give opportunity to the parties to settle the dispute between the husband and wife amicably. 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. Continuation of the proceeding would amount to abuse of process of law leading to vexatious proceeding against the petitioners.

8. 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.

9. Both the parties are agreed to settle the dispute outside the Court and they have willingly desired to appear before the learned District Court on 19.11.2025 at 10:30 AM.

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

11. Learned Mediator of the District Mediation Center concerned 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 petitioners in connection with the aforesaid case.

12. In case of failure on the part of the petitioners to appear on 07.10.2025 before the learned District Court or any date fixed by the learned Mediator, the interim protection granted to the petitioners shall automatically lose its force.

13. In case, the parties fail to reconcile, then in that case, the learned District Court shall proceed with the trial.

14. 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.

15. This Court is conscious of the fact that petitioner is making payment of the agreed amount on account of child welfare, however, taking into account the rise in price of the articles and trend of market, investment incurred on account of education of the child and the inflation, this Court finds it proper to fix the amount of investment on account of care of the child and her welfare to Rs. 30,000/- per months. The petitioner must not be denied of visiting rights for proper development of the child, who requires love and affection of the parents.

16. This Court finds it proper that for overall growth of the child, who has not attained majority till date, the petitioner and the opposite party no. 2 must be more concerned about the growth of their child instead of fighting, affecting both mental and physical growth of the child, they must reconcile their strained relationship.

17. Accordingly, the present quashing application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Niraj/-

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

