

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90289 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1400 Year-2023 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - PATNA CITY
District- Patna

=====

Manisha Kumari W/o Sanjay Verma @ Sonu D/o Anil Prasad, Resident of
Mohalla - Ganga Babu ke Theki Hajiganj, P.O - Jhauganj, P.S - Chowk,
District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sanjay Verma @ Sonu S/o Bharat Prasad Verma R/o Mohalla - Pakki
Goraiya, Mahabir Asthan, P.O - Jhauganj, P.S - Khajekalan, District - Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Yerra Madhavi, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Pramod Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Opp. Party No.2	:	Mr. Yash Mathur, Advocate
		Mrs. Kirti Mathur, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 22-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

APP for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party

no.2.

2. This application has been filed for

cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the opposite party
no.2 by a Coordinate Bench of this Court *vide* order dated
08.09.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 87224 of 2024 in connection
with Complaint Case No. 1400 of 2023 registered for the offence
under Sections 498(A)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed

for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the opposite party



no.2 on the ground that the opposite party no.2 is not keeping his wife with dignity.

4. I have perused the impugned order granting bail to the opposite party no. 2. It appears that it is a matrimonial dispute and the Coordinate Bench of this Court had granted anticipatory bail to the opposite party no.2 on the ground that both the parties had appeared in Court and they had jointly submitted that they are residing in a happy and cordial atmosphere, and no dispute remains between them. However, it appears that the parties are not interested in staying together anymore. Further, no supervening circumstance has been brought on record to show that the opposite party no.2 has misused the privilege of bail and violated any condition of bail.

5. In view of the above, this Court finds no sufficient ground to interfere with the impugned order. No ground for cancellation of bail is made out.

6. Accordingly, this application is rejected.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

shalini/-

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

