

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.11425 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -111 Year- 2016 Thana -PIPRAKOTHI District-
EASTCHAMPARAN(MOTIHARI)

=====

1. Kedar Sahni, Son of Sogarath Sahni, Resident of Village- Jhitkahia,
P.S.- Motihari Muffasil (Lakhaura), District- East Champaran.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shakti Suman Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Nityanand Tiwary

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 12-04-2018 The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Piprakothi P.S. Case No. 111/16, registered for offences punishable under Sections 420, 363, 365 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegation against the petitioner is of taking Rs. 5,00,000/- from the informant on the false assurance of providing job to the daughter of informant and when the informant demanded the money back he did not return the same and, thereafter, the informant went to Meghalaya for earning his livelihood and further allegation that petitioner called the daughter of the informant on the pretext that he would return the above stated amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- and, thereafter, the daughter of informant is missing.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that he has falsely been implicated in this case and he has not taken any



money from the informant and he has also no role to play in disappearance of daughter of the informant and except the statement of informant and his wife, there is nothing against the petitioner. Further submission is that the victim was a married woman and she was at litigating terms with her husband as she has filed a case under Section 498A of the IPC as well as Maintenance case against her husband and she might have gone out of her own will.

Heard learned A.P.P. as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant. They have opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that in the supervision note also, the Dy.S.P. has found that the petitioner has called the victim woman to take the money and, thereafter, she was missing.

Having heard both sides, considering the facts and nature of allegation, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner rather he should surrender and make prayer for regular bail, which will be considered by the court below on the merit of the case, without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

Accordingly, this application is disposed of.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

sunil/-

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

