

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86034 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-478 Year-2023 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
Rohtas

=====

AMARJEET KUMAR @ AMARJEET @ AMARJEET SINGH S/O
MAHENDRA SINGH Resident of Village - Dhaudad, Police Station-
Sasaram (Muff), District- Rohtas at Sasaram

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Durgawati Kumari D/O Late Bhaironath Singh Resident of Village -
Khirabhudhar, Police Station- Bikramganj, District- Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Raghunandan Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Nand Kumar, APP
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Krishna Murari, Advocate

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

6 09-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for
the State as well as learned counsel for the opposite party no.2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Complaint Case No. 478 of 2023, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 323, 498(A) and 406 of the Indian Penal
Code and Section 3/4 of the D.P. Act.

3. The complainant Durgawati Kumari made allegation
that her marriage was solemnized with the petitioner according to
Hindu rites and customs on 27.04.2021. The customary presents were
given at the time of marriage according to affording capacity of the
parents of the complainant, but the accused persons made pressure
upon the victim to fulfill the demand of Pulsar Bike and Golden
chain. After birth of a child, the torture and torments of accused



continued. Lastly, she was ousted from her matrimonial house.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that it was not possible for the petitioner and the victim to reside together and it was the reason that she went to her *mai*ke along with her child and in this respect a *panchayatnama* was entered into between the parties duly signed by them.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the prayer for bail, and submitted that the matter has become irretrievable because the petitioner has solemnized the second marriage.

6. In order to explore the possibility of restoration of the cordial relations between the parties, this case was referred to the Mediation Centre. The report of the Mediation Centre dated 21.08.2025 is available on the record which shows that neither the petitioner nor his counsel appeared before the learned Mediator despite the fact that the case was referred to the Mediation Centre in presence of both the parties.

7. The conduct of the petitioner shows that he is reluctant in resolving the dispute, as such, he is not entitled for the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

AjayMishra/-

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

