

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45664 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-18 Year-2019 Thana- BHIMPUR District- Supaul

1. KRITYANAND SINGH Son of Late Panchlal Singh, Resident of Village - Laska Ramghat, Ward No. 09, P.S.- Narpatganj, District- Araria
2. Shushila Devi Wife of Krityanand Singh, Resident of Village - Laska Ramghat, Ward No. 09, P.S.- Narpatganj, District- Araria
3. Suchita Kumari D/O- Ram Swaroop Singh, Resident of Village - Bhimpur, Ward No. 12, P.S.- Bhimpur, District- Supaul
4. Punita Devi @ Bugiya Devi D/O - Nand Kishore Singh, Resident of Village - Bhimpur, Ward No. 12, P.S.- Bhimpur, District- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Nafisuzzoha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anuj Kumar Shrivastava

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

4 30-09-2019 Heard both sides.

Petitioners apprehend their arrest in Bhimpur P.S.

Case No.18 of 2019 registered under Sections 366(A) of the
Indian Penal Code.

The informant (brother of the victim) disclosed that
Suchita Kumari and Punita Devi @ Bugiya Devi took his sister
on the pretext of cutting grass but Dharmendra Kumar @
Dharmendra Singh, Krityanand Singh, Sushila Devi and
Shankar Singh all forcibly took the victim to different places for
the purpose of marriage.



Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no.3 (Suchita Kumari) and petitioner no.4 (Punita Devi @ Bugiya Devi) are friends of the victim and they did not kidnap the victim. The victim was recovered from the house of petitioner no.1 (Krityanand Singh) and petitioner no.2 (Shushila Devi). Dharmendra Singh is the son of petitioner nos.1 and 2. Even the victim in her statement under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. did not make any sort of allegation against petitioner no.3 (Suchita Kumari) and petitioner no.4 (Punita Devi @ Bugiya Devi). The victim disclosed that she was recovered from the house of Krityanand Singh where his son committed rape with the victim.

Having considered the facts that the victim made specific allegation that petitioner no.1 (Krityanand Singh), petitioner no.2 (Shushila Devi), Dharmendra Singh and others forcibly confined her and Dharmendra Singh (son of petitioner nos.1 and 2) committed rape with the victim, I am not inclined to enlarge petitioner nos.1 and 2 on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

So far the case of petitioner no.3 (Suchita Kumari) and petitioner no.4 (Punita Devi @ Bugiya Devi) is concerned, the informant of course disclosed that they took the victim to



their house on the pretext of cutting grass but the victim in her statement under section 164 of the Cr.P.C. did not make any allegation that petitioner nos.3 and 4 played any role in kidnapping the victim.

Having considered the facts, petitioner no.3 (Suchita Kumari) and petitioner no.4 (Punita Devi @ Bugiya Devi), in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned court below within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, are directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned A.C.J.M. II, Supaul in connection with Bhimpur P.S. Case No.18 of 2019, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

Harish/-

U			
---	--	--	--

