

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12920 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-836 Year-2012 Thana- MUZFFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Muzaffarpur

ANUPMA ANAND Wife of Sishir Kumar Resident of Village - Mahmadpur,
P.S- Sakra, Distt - Muzaffarpur. Presently Anupma Anand, D/o Sri Madan
Mohan Thakur, R/v - Dwarikapur, P.S.- Sakra, Distt - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shishir Kumar Son of Sri Manibhushan Prasad Singh Resident of Village - Mahmadpur, P.S- Sakra, Distt - Muzaffarpur. At present House No. 575/01 Dilli Road Mahadev Puram, Sector - I, Meerut (U.P.)

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Nitya Nand Tiwary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

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

2. The present application has been filed for
cancellation of Provisional bail granted to the O.P. No. 2 by this
Court vide order dated 18.11.2013 passed in Cr. Misc. No.
18608 of 2013.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
provisional bail was granted to the O.P. No. 2 on the ground that
a board of medical officers will conduct an examination of the
complainant with regard to the mental abrasion of the
complainant and if the same is found to be true, the provisional
bail of the opposite party no. 2 will be confirmed and if the
medical board suggests otherwise then the opposite party no. 2
would take the complainant to her matrimonial house to keep



her as his wife.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the opposite party no. 2 has not taken the complainant to her matrimonial home even though the petitioner is ready to live with him as his wife.

5. I have perused the impugned order, granting bail to the opposite party no. 2 and I am not inclined to interfere with the same particularly since the impugned order is dated 18.11.2013 and the present application has been filed in the year 2020.

6. Considering that seven years have elapsed since the impugned order granting bail to the opposite party no. 2, it will not be appropriate to interfere with the same togetherwith the fact that the learned counsel for the petitioner has not raised any satisfactory ground for the cancellation of the provisional bail granted to the opposite party no. 2.

7. Accordingly, the present application stands dismissed.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

pallavi/-

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

