

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38672 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-86 Year-2019 Thana- FATUA District- Patna

-
1. Sanjay Rai, aged about 42 years, Male, Son of Shri Jai Ram Singh Yadav Resident of Village - Shisha Mill, P.S.- Fatuha, Distt - Patna.
 2. Smt. Indu Devi, aged about 38 years, Female, Wife of Sanjay Rai Resident of Village - Shisha Mill, P.S.- Fatuha, Distt - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Deepak Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. M.K. Nirala, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 25-06-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel for the State.

In this case, the petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Fatuha P.S. Case No. 86 of 2019 registered for offences under sections 366(A)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

In the present case, an allegation has been made by the Informant that her minor daughter, namely, Rinku Kumari has been taken away by one Aarush Kumar Yadav @ Tulshi Kumar for the purpose of marriage.

The statement of the victim girl Rinku Kumari made under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. shows that she, on her



own volition, went to Delhi with Tulsi Kumar and performed her marriage with him in a temple.

The present petitioners are father and mother of the accused boy Tulshi Kumar.

Looking to the entire facts and circumstances of the case, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of four weeks from today, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-V, Patna City, Patna in connection with Fatuha P.S. Case No. 86 of 2019, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. as also subject to condition that whenever the police will call the petitioners for investigation/interrogation, they will remain present and if they would not present themselves, the privilege of grant of anticipatory bail shall be deemed to have been canceled.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

rishi/-

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

