

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25245 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-88 Year-2019 Thana- HAYAGHAT District- Darbhanga

LAXMAN KUMAR @ VIKASH Son of Sri Mangal Rai, Resident of Village-
Veer Singhpur, P.S.- Kalyanpur, District- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Abhay Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bharat Lal, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER**

3 04-11-2020 Heard both sides through Video Conferencing.

Petitioner seeks bail in Hayaghat P.S. Case No.88 of
2019 registered under Sections 364A, 506 and 34 of the IPC.

The informant alleged that his son is paralyzed.
During course of talk for treatment of his son, he came across
with Labh Singh. Labh Singh was also associated with an
N.G.O., who assured the informant that he would get
appropriate treatment and medicine. On the request of Labh
Singh, the informant went to Darbhanga along with Lal Singh.
On a telephone, many persons came and got him stayed. They
were asking about consignment loaded on a truck. It is further
alleged that the accused persons took him and confined him in a
hut. They started demanding money. The accused persons also
called his son from mobile of the informant and demanded



ransom. It is further alleged that the informant on advice of his son, informed the police on telephone no.100. The police came and rescued the informant. The petitioner and two other persons were also apprehended.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has in fact committed no offence. The petitioner has not kidnapped the informant for ransom. Some dispute arose due to supply of liquor. Labh Singh had taken money from the petitioner and others for supply of liquor but no liquor was supplied. At the instance of Labh Singh, the informant had come to the place of the petitioner and others. The petitioner never kidnapped the informant rather the informant was staying with the petitioner till the arrival of the consignment of liquor. The petitioner is in jail since 24.12.2019 but from perusal of the F.I.R., it appears that the informant was forcibly confined in a hut and a demand of ransom was made from the son of the informant. It is a case of kidnapping for ransom.

Having considered the facts aforesaid and the nature of allegations made against the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. Accordingly, the same is rejected.



The trial court is directed to expedite the trial and hold the trial on day to day basis after framing of charge and conclude the same within nine months from the date of receipt of this order. If the trial is not concluded within nine months, the petitioner, if so advised, may renew his prayer for bail.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

Harish/-

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

