

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.49131 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -192 Year- 2014 Thana -GORAUL District- VAISHALI(HAJIPUR)

- =====
1. Nagendra Singh Son of Late Shyam Narayan Singh
 2. Nitsh Kumar Son of Nagendra Singh
 3. Pappu Kumar Son of Nagendra Singh
 4. Ratnesh Kumar Son of Nagendra Singh All to 4 are resident of Village - Haujpura P.S. Belsor Distt- Vaishali.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anirudh Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umeshanand Pandit(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 08-05-2015 The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Goraul P.S.Case No.192 of 2014 instituted under Section 364 (A) of the Indian Penal Code.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the State.

The prosecution story, in brief, is that on 23.6.2014 at about 1 P.M. the informant's husband, namely, Ashok Kumar had gone to Goraul Chowk along with Ratnesh Kumar where one Tuntun Singh came on Bolero vehicle and requested Ashok Singh to accompany with him as he has some urgent work at Muzaffarpur and thereafter Ashok Singh did not return back. It is alleged that on 6.7.2014 one phone call was received by Ranjeet Kumar sent by Ashok Kumar by which Rs. 7 lacs was demanded



within three days otherwise Said Ashok Singh will be done to death and one Tuntun Singh had knowledge that on which place the money was to be delivered. Then Mohan Singh, Ranjeet Kumar and Akhilesh Singh went at the house of Tuntun Singh and enquired into the matter and Tuntun Singh told that Ashok Singh will be returned within three- four days. On 9.7.2014 Tuntun Singh told to Nagendra Singh to inform the informant to give Rs. 7 lacs otherwise the said Ashok Singh will be killed.

It is submitted on behalf of the petitioners that they have falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that petitioner no.1 is the Bahnoi of the victim and petitioner nos. 2,3 and 4 are his Bhagina. It is also submitted that prior to the occurrence there was money transaction between the parties and when the said money, which was given by the petitioners to the informant side, was demanded by him then the informant brought the present prosecution only to avoid payment of the said money.

On behalf of the State, it has been submitted that the petitioners have been named by the victim in course of investigation and there is demand of ransom, as alleged, against the petitioners.

Considering the aforesaid facts, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Their prayer for

anticipatory bail stands rejected.

However, in case the petitioners surrender in the court below within a period of four weeks and seek regular bail, the same shall be considered by the court below without being prejudiced by this order of rejection. It has further been submitted on behalf of the informant that the matter has been resolved between the parties, the same may be taken into account when petitioners seek regular bail.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

singh/-

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