

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23753 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-118 Year-2017 Thana- BACHHWARA District- Begusarai

PINTU KUMAR @ PINTU RAM Son of Ramkhelavan Resident of Village-
Kursat, Kursath, P.S.-Aasiwan, District-Unnao (U.P)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nafisuzzoha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

5 11-12-2020 Heard Mr. Nafisuzzoha, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad, Additional Public

Prosecutor for the state through video conferencing.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Bachhwara PS Case No. 118/2017 registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 366, 366(A) of the IPC.

3. The allegation, as per First Information Report, is
that on 01.08.2017 daughter of the informant aged about 14
years had gone outside of her house to attend call of nature but
she did not return back. The informant searched her daughter
but she became traceless. It is further alleged that the nephew of
the informant was working in Mumbai in a Shoe Factory and
the petitioner was also working in the same Shoe Factory and
nephew of the informant had given mobile number of the



informant to the petitioner. Petitioner used to talk with the daughter of the informant and daughter of the informant also used to talk with the petitioner. The daughter of the informant is still traceless.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not committed any offence in the manner alleged and he has falsely been implicated in this case on the basis of CDR (Call Detail Record) of the mobile phone which shows that the petitioner was having talks with the daughter of the informant. Learned counsel further submits that except Call Detail Record of the mobile, there is no material to connect the petitioner with present offence and petitioner is in custody since 23.04.2018.

5. Learned counsel for the State, referring to the case diary, submits that Call Detail Record of the mobile, reveals that even after the date of occurrence, i.e., 01.08.2017, the petitioner was continuously having talks with the victim girl till 17.08.2018 and the victim girl is still traceless.

6. This Court vide order dated 04.11.2020 had called for a report from the learned court below regarding stage of trial and pursuant to the said order, learned court below has submitted the report revealing the fact that out of seven charge-



sheet witnesses, two witnesses have been examined and the learned court below has given the estimated time of six months for concluding the trial.

7. Having regard to the submissions made by the parties and taking into consideration the material on record I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the present application for bail filed on behalf of the petitioner stands rejected.

8. However, if so advised, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after six months, if the trial is not concluded.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez

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

