

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63988 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-724 Year-2018 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - JHANJIHARPUR
District- Madhubani

=====

Sneha Kumari D/o Late Dev Narayan Prasad and W/o Anand Kumar Poddar
@ Anand Poddar Resident of village- Atari, PO- Laukahi, PS- Laukahi,
District- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Anand Kumar Poddar @ Anand Poddar S/o Jagarnath Poddar R/o Sutapatti,
Muzaffarpur, P.S.- Muzaffarpur Town, Distt.- Muzaffarpur, at present
Residing at 15 GH, Aam Gola, Kalyani, Naka no. 3, Pankha Toli, Musahri,
P.S.- Muzaffarpur Town, Distt.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravindra Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajiv Nayan, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER**

2 05-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The present application for cancellation of bail has been filed against the order dated 23.07.2020 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court whereby and whereunder the anticipatory bail was granted to the opposite party no.2 in view of the undertaking given by the learned counsel for the petitioner (present opposite party no.2) that the petitioner (opposite party no.2) was ready to give maintenance amount of Rs.15,000/- per month and certain conditions had also been laid down in the said order.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the opposite party no.2, despite his undertaking has not been making payment to the petitioner (wife) regularly and he has stated in



paragraph-12 of this petition that up till now payment of 27 months out of 60 months have only been received up-to July, 2025.

4. It is apparent from the order dated 23.07.2020 that there is already a condition bearing condition no.(iii) wherein it has been enumerated that in case the petitioner fails to deposit the maintenance amount for two consecutive months, the Court below would be at liberty to cancel the bail bond; It is clear from leveling of such condition that the Court, granting the privilege of anticipatory bail to the opposite party no.2, had granted liberty to the Court concerned where matter is pending to cancel the bail bond in case of failure of deposit amount for two consecutive months. In such view of the matter, this Court does not feel inclined to interfere with the order granting anticipatory bail as the said liberty has already been granted to the concerned Court and in case the petitioner approaches the Court concerned for redressal of her grievance, the same may be taken into consideration by the Court concerned in accordance with law, preferably within three months of filing of such application.

5. With the aforesaid liberty and observation, the present application is disposed of.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

anand/-

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

