

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No. 43858 of 2016**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -93 Year- 2016 Thana -BEGUSARAI MUFFASIL District-  
BEGUSARAI

- =====
1. Govind Kumar @ Govind Sharma, Son of Ramchandra Sharma.
  2. Ram Babu Kumar @ Ram Babu Roy @ Ram Babu Kuvar, Son of Shambhu Rai.
- Both resident of Village- Ayodhyabari, P.S.- Muffasil, District- Begusarai.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Bhola Chaudhary, Son of Late Bindeshwari Chaudhary, resident of Village- Lalunagar Ayodhyabari, P.S.- Muffasil, District- Begusarai.

.... .... Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                                    |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Yogesh Kumar, Advocate         |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Arun Kumar Singh No. 5, A.P.P. |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH**  
**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date: 04-10-2016**

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioners apprehend arrest in Begusarai  
Muffasil P.S. Case No. 93 of 2016 dated 29.02.2016 instituted under  
Sections 366A/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The allegation against the petitioners and others is  
that they had taken away the minor daughter of the informant for the  
purposes of forcing her into flesh trade and upon recovery of girl, in  
her statement under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure,  
1973, she has named the petitioners also as among the persons, who  
had taken her away from her house.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the

girl is aged about 16-17 years, as per the medical report, and she has gone on her free will due to love affairs and later on, the matter has also been compromised between the parties.

Learned A.P.P. submits that there is specific allegation both in the *fardbeyan* as well as in the statement of the victim girl before the Court implicating the petitioners for forcible abduction.

Having considered the rival contentions, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the prayer is rejected.

However, in the event the petitioners surrender before the Court below and seek regular bail within four weeks from today, the Court below shall pass appropriate orders without being prejudiced by the present order.

**(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)**

P. Kumar

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR |
| CAV DATE          | NA   |
| Uploading Date    |      |
| Transmission Date |      |