

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29853 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-465 Year-2018 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Vikash Kumar Son of Mukhdeo Mandal, Resident of Village-Gadha, Police
Station-Runnisaidpur, District-Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Vikramdeo Singh, Advocate Ms.Madhubala Verma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Kalyan Shankar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 07-05-2019 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Runnisaidpur
P.S. Case No.465 of 2018 registered under Sections 363, 366(A)
and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The father of the victim alleged that when he returned
to his house, he did not find his daughter inside the house.
During course of search, many witnesses disclosed that the
petitioner and others enticed his daughter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner and his family members have been made accused. The
mother and brother of petitioner have already been granted
anticipatory bail by order dated 12.04.2019 passed in
Cr.Misc.No.23786 of 2019. The case of the petitioner stands on



the same footing. The victim made her statement under section 164 of the Cr.P.C. and same and similar allegations are made against two other accused persons, namely, Krishna Devi and Raja Kumar (mother and brother of the petitioner), therefore, the petitioner also deserves anticipatory bail.

It appears from perusal of the statements recorded under section 164 of the Cr.P.C. that it was the petitioner, who enticed the victim and persuaded her to sit in four-wheeler on the pretext to drop her at her residence. The father, mother and brother of the petitioner were also sitting inside the vehicle. The petitioner took her to different place and kept her confined. The victim did not whisper any word against the parents and brother of the petitioner.

Having considered the facts aforesaid and the fact that the petitioner enticed the minor victim and kept her confined for many days, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

Harish/-

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

