

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.15144 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -11 Year- 2017 Thana -NANHPUR District- SITAMARHI

- =====
1. Shiv Chandra Sah
 2. Jitan Sah Both Sons of Mahendra Sah Resident of Village- Dhanushi,
P.S. Runni Saidpur, District- Sitamarhi.

.... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kumar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ramchandra Sahani

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

2 27-04-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel for the State.

The petitioners are accused in connection with Nanpur P.S. Case No. 11 of 2017, registered under Sections 363 and 364 (A) of Indian Penal Code, pending in the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sitamarhi.

The accusation is that on 11.01.2017 Arpit Kumar aged about two years, son of the informant, and Vikash Kumar, aged about 10 years were playing. In the meantime, two persons came on motorcycle and boarded the children on his motorcycle. Later on, Vikash Kumar was left and Arpit Kumar, son of the informant, was taken by them. Thereafter, informant searched his son, but no trace was found and in the evening ransom of Rs. 10 Lakhs was made through Mobile No. 7260980806 on the mobile of informant bearing



No. 9709523223.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the F.I.R., but in course of investigation Rajesh Mahato was apprehended by the Police on suspicion, who confessed his guilt having hand in the kidnapping of the son of the informant and he also disclosed about keeping the boy at the house of petitioner. Thereafter, the victim was recovered from the house of petitioner. Further submission is that, in fact, Rajesh Mahato kept two years boy at the house of the petitioner, but he did not come to take back. Thereafter, the petitioner informed regarding missing of the child to local people and also to concerned P.S., but with ulterior motive, the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioners have no criminal antecedent and they are in custody since 13.01.2017.

Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioners.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and nature of allegation, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. Accordingly, prayer of the petitioners, above named, is rejected.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

