

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10198 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-277 Year-2018 Thana- BIRAUL District- Darbhanga

1. ARUN DAS, Son of Ganga Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.
2. Manoj Das Son of Bishundeo Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.
3. Birendra Das @ Chhedi Das Son of Brahmdeo Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.
4. Nirmal Das Son of Brahmdeo Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.
5. Ajay Kumar Das @ Ajay Das Son of Mantun Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.
6. Sambhu Das @ Shambhu Das Son of Mantun Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.
7. Girdhari Das @ Giridhari Das Son of Rameshwar Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.
8. Mantun Das Son of Rameshwar Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.
9. Lalit Das Son of Ganga Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.
10. Ganga Das Son of Rameshwar Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.
11. Nathuni Das Son of Mahabir Das Resident of Village - Talibpur, P.S. Biraul, District - Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Nachiketa Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 16-05-2019 Petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in connection with Biraul P.S. Case No. 277 of 2018 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 458, 341,



323, 364, 379 and 504 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegation as per FIR is that the informant has married with the victim, which was love marriage and accused persons were annoyed with that and they came to the house the petitioners and others came variously armed and dragged the wife of the informant and confined her in the house of one co-accused and later on she was recovered by police. It further appears that at the time of her recovery the accused persons did not allow the police to recover her.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioners is that in the kidnapping of wife of informant a case has been lodged and though she was minor but she has been allowed bail considering her to be a major and accused persons have been falsely implicated and no specific allegation has been attributed against them.

Heard learned APP and learned counsel for the informant. They have opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground that the girl was released in favour of informant and she was forcibly taken by the accused persons and she was recovered from the house of one co-accused by the police and materials collected during investigation also disclosed that the police party was also attacked by the petitioners and other



accused persons, when they went to recover the girl.

In view of above facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Hence, this application is dismissed.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

spal/-

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

