

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17621 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-167 Year-2018 Thana- JOGAPATTI District- West Champaran

Satyendra Yadav @ Satyendra Kumar Yadav, Son of Sri Bhuteli Yadav
Resident of Village- Jamuniya, P.S.- Jogapatti (Shanichari), District- West
Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Chandra Verma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mithlesh Kumar Khare, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER**

6 16-07-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP representing the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Jogapatti P.S. Case No. 167 of 2018, registered under
Sections 363, 365 and 370 of the Indian Penal Code.

The allegation against the petitioner is that the son
of the informant was taken to Barabanki, Lucknow by the
petitioner with the assurance that the petitioner would provide
him a job of Rs. 7,000/-. It has further been alleged that after
about one month, when the informant tried to contact the
petitioner on cell phone, the petitioner could not be contacted
and he went to his home after a month, the petitioner told the
informant that he does not know the whereabouts of the
informant's son. It is further been alleged that thereafter the
informant tried to search his son, but his son has not been traced



out.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is quite innocent and son of the informant is major having reasonable intellects. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that there is delay of above 9 months in lodging the First Information Report inasmuch as when after a month petitioner told the informant that he was not knowing the whereabouts of the son of the informant, the First Information Report has been lodged after lapse of 9 months as mentioned therein.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submits that the case is serious in nature and merely delay, on the part of the informant in informing the police, may not be taken as a ground for grant of bail inasmuch as in this case the boy has not been recovered till date and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner by the police may be necessary.

After having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that boy has still not been recovered and the fact that the petitioner had taken the boy on the assurance of giving him a job, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail to the



petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

Sujit/
S. Katyayan/-

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

