

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.63900 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -828 Year- 1999 Thana -COMPLAINT CASE District- ARRARIA

=====

1. Beni Rishideo, S/o Late Boku Rishideo, Resident of Village- Mojaha,
P.S.- Bhargama, District- Araria.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Mahabir Rishideo, S/o Late Badari Rishideo, Resident of Village-
Mojaha, P.S.- Bhargama, District- Araria.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhijeet Gautam, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar-1, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 25-10-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned A.P.P. for the State.

The Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Supplementary Complaint Case No. 828C/1999, registered for
offences punishable under Sections 147, 326, 354, 364, 365, 120B
of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegation against the petitioner as per F.I.R. is that
the petitioner along with other co-accused had taken away the son
of the complainant to earn more money at Panjab but he did not
return and it was alleged that the petitioner and others have
kidnapped the son of the complainant.

Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner
is that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case only
on the basis of suspicion and nothing has been found against the



petitioner and he has no criminal antecedent and the petitioner is in custody since 06.05.2018.

Heard learned A.P.P also.

Having heard both sides and in view of the facts and circumstances, as stated above, let the petitioner, above named, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty five thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge, Araria in connection with Supplementary Complaint Case No. 828C/1999, subject to the following conditions:-

- i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be a local person having sufficient immovable property within the jurisdiction of the concerned Court.
- ii) The petitioner will not induce any witness or tamper with the evidence.
- iii) It is made clear that if petitioner found involved in any of the like offences, in future, prosecution is free to move for cancellation of his bail bonds.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

Sudha/-

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

