

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.29401 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -123 Year- 2015 Thana -AJAMNAGAR District- KATIHAR

=====

Pancha Nand Jha son of Sri Bijay Jha, resident of Village- Pachra, P.S.-
Balrampur, District- Katihar.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bimal Kumar, Advocate,

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Anil Kumar Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

2 02-09-2016

Heard.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Azamnagar P.S. Case No. 123 of 2015 instituted for the offences
punishable under Sections 366(A) and 120B of the Indian Penal
Code.

The father of the victim filed a written report about missing
of his daughter Priya Adhikari, aged about 17 years from
29.06.2015. He raised suspicion that his daughter was enticed
away by Ram Pukar Mandal, Govind Mandal, Shakuntala Devi,
Munni Kumari, Mangala Mandal, Balram Mandal, Nitya Nand
Mandal and five unknown persons in a conspiracy. The victim
girl was recovered subsequently. After five months she was
produced before the Magistrate for recording her statement under
Section 164 Cr.P.C. Her statement is at Annexure 2. In her
statement she stated about what happened with her and she also

stated that the accused persons had taken her at different places. She further stated that the petitioner appeared before her and took her signature on five blank papers. The petitioner also took her picture in a mobile. Thereafter again she was administered some intoxicant. At a different places her dress was changed and thereafter it is stated that she was taken in a car to a place where Mukhia and his father was present.

Contention of the petitioner is that he is not named in the First Information Report. In fact the petitioner assisted in restoring the possession of the victim to the family. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the implication of the petitioner in the crime is writ large which is serious. From the impugned order it appears that prosecution case has been supported by the witnesses also.

Looking to the gravity of the case and other facts evidencing from the record, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

Prakash/-

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