

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44607 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-41 Year-2025 Thana- NARHATT District- Nawada

Rajesh Kumar, aged about 30 years (Male), S/O Musafir Yadav, Resident of Village- Taropur Tola, Kyapur, P.S- Narhat, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Kumari Kiran D/O Kuleshwar Prasad R/O Village- Bhelwatand, P.S- Sirdalla, Distt.- Nawada.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sheo Kumar Prasad, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Rajeev Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Nagendra Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 21-01-2026 Heard Mr. Sheo Kumar Prasad, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner; Mr. Rajeev Kumar, learned counsel for the complainant and Mr. Nagendra Prasad, learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in connection with Narhat P.S. Case No. 41 of 2025, registered for the offence(s) punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 110, 351, 3(5) of the BNS and Sections 3/4 of the D.P. Act.

3. As per the allegation made in the FIR, the marriage of the complainant was solemnized with the petitioner on as per Hindu Rites and Custom. After some time of marriage, petitioner and his other family members, had started demanding



rupees eight lac from the parent of the informant and due to non-fulfillment of the same, they had subjected the informant to various sorts of torture and ousted her from her matrimonial house.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submitted that petitioner always tries to lead a peaceful married life with the informant but she never co-operates with him on the instigation of her family members. Learned counsel further submitted that marriage is a sacred ceremony but little matrimonial skirmish suddenly erupts into hatred and the parties ponder to reconcile their dispute outside the court.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposing the prayer for grant of pre-arrest bail submitted that an opportunity may be given to the parties to resolve their dispute amicably outside the Court.

6. Learned APP appearing on behalf of the State submitted that a chance be given to the parties for amicable settlement outside the court.

7. However, at this stage, learned counsel for the respective parties, on instruction, submitted that the parties have



agreed to appear before the learned District Court at 10:30 A.M. on 19.02.2026 for resolving the dispute by way of mediation.

8. Heard the parties.

10. The parties have willingly desired to appear before the learned District Court on 19.02.2026, so that the matter can be referred to the District Mediation Centre.

11. Learned District Court is directed to take necessary steps to refer the matter before the learned Mediator of the District Mediation Center by fixing a date for appearance of the parties to give effect to Mediation 2.0.

12. Learned Mediator of the District Mediation Center concerned upon appearance of the parties on the fixed date 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 petitioner in connection with the aforesaid case.

13. In case, the parties resolve their dispute amicably or arrive at a mutual settlement, in light of the law laid down by the Apex Court, the petitioner is required to be released on pre-arrest bail on such terms and conditions as the learned District Court deems it fit and proper.



14. In case of failure on the part of the petitioner to appear on 19.02.2026 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 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. In case, the parties fail to reconcile, then in that case, parties may avail appropriate remedy. Then also, petitioner is directed to be released on pre-arrest bail on such terms and conditions as the learned District Court deems it fit and proper.

17. With aforesaid direction and observation, the present application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Niraj/-

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

