

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9891 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1485 Year-2017 Thana- KATIHAR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Katihar

=====

BIBI NUJHAT @ BIBI NUZHAR W/o Md. Shamim, D/o late Ghulam Rabbani R/o village- Khenda Bari, P.S.- Balia Belon, District- Katihar, Presently resident at village- Ranga Pokhar, P.S.- Azamnagar, District- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Md. Shamim S/o Md. Mohin R/o village- Khenda Bari, P.O.- Sadapur, P.S.- Balia Belon, District- Katihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ashish Bhaskar, Advocate Mr. Bhola Prasad, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 15-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The present application has been filed by the petitioner for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the opposite party no. 2 by this Court vide order dated 19.12.2018 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 74330 of 2018 arising out of Complaint Case no. 1485/2017 registered for offence under section 354 (B), 498(A) I.P.C. and $\frac{3}{4}$ D.P. Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the opposite party no. 2 was granted bail on the condition that he



shall take all necessary steps to provide mental peace and security to the complainant and if any untoward incident happens leading to mental or physical torture to the complainant she may approach this Court for appropriate orders.

4. It has been further submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the opposite party no. 2 has contravened the conditions of the impugned order dated 19.12.2018 and has refused to keep the petitioner with him as his wife and is also not co-operating in the trial.

5. Considering the fact, that the impugned order is dated 19.12.2018 by which the opposite party no. 2 was granted bail and the fact that around eight years have elapsed since then, I am not inclined to interfere with the impugned order.

6. Accordingly, this application stands dismissed.

7. However, in view of the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner the S.D.J.M., Katihar/ concerned Court is directed to conclude the trial arising out of Complaint Case no. 1485 of 2017 within six months from today.

8. The S.D.J.M., Katihar/ concerned Court will file a compliance report after six months or after conclusion of the trial, whichever is earlier.

9. This application stands disposed of.



10. List this case after six months for perusal of the
report of the concerned Court below.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

aarti/-

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

