

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.15155 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -176 Year- 2015 Thana -DHARHARA District- MUNGER

=====

Ram Sahni Son of Late Bali Sahni Resident of Village - Hemjapur, P.S. –
Dharhara, District - Munger.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bhola Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Kanhaiya Kishore(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-05-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Dharhara P.S. Case No.176 of 2015 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 370 and 366(A) of the Indian Penal
Code.

Allegedly, victim Prema Kumari, aged about 12
years the daughter of the informant and Bijli Kumari aged 13
years, the daughter of Dinesh Ram, used to visit the house of the
petitioner to meet Reena Devi, the daughter of the petitioner and
on 27.12.2015 the petitioner and Reena Devi kidnapped Prema
Kumari and Bijli Kumari. During investigation the police



recovered Prema Kumari from a village of the District- Badaun (U.P.) whereas Bijli Kumari was recovered from District- Ata (U.P.). Prema Kumari in her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. stated that Rina Devi and her father(petitioner) boarded her and Bijli Kumari in the train and from there they came at railway station situated in U.P. where two women came and brought them and got married her forcibly. Victim Bijli Kumari has further stated that Bablu committed rape with her and also she was sold for Rs.40,000/-.

Submission is of false implication and there is no specific allegation against him, both the victims went away herself but due to some earlier dispute the petitioner has been falsely implicated. There is no specific allegation against the petitioner and as such he deserves sympathetic consideration as the petitioner is suffering in custody since 31.12.2015.

Learned A.P.P. opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner and his daughter have committed serious offence.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, at present I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, accordingly, it is rejected.

However, let the trial be expedited and the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after examination of the informant and two victims.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

AnilKrSinha/-

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