

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39567 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-264 Year-2020 Thana- LAHERIMUHALLA District- Nalanda

Ketan Kumar, son of Sanjay Kumar Singh, Resident of Village- Dhansai,
Tola- Vande, P.S.- Rajgir, District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Jha, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 12-03-2021 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Laheri P.S. Case No.264 of 2020 registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 364 and 120B of the Indian Penal
Code.

The case of the prosecution is that the
informant's husband has been called by co-accused
Suryakant Singh @ Sonu and thereafter he has not returned.
Under the circumstances, the informant has informed the
police and the victim has been recovered in a vehicle in
which the instant petitioner was also moving with the victim
along with co-accused Karu, Chiku Kumar and Neeshu
Kumar.



Petitioner's counsel submits that it is a case of false implication. The petitioner is a student and his continued incarceration would only have adverse impact on him. The petitioner continues to be in custody since 18.07.2020. Further submission is that there is no allegation of assault or such overt act against the petitioner.

Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail. It is submitted that while rejecting the petitioner's prayer for bail, the learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI, Nalanda at Bihar Sharif has taken note of the material which has come subsequent to the recovery of the victim, including the statement of the victim recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., wherein he has specifically stated about the instant petitioner keeping him confined at pistol point. It is also stated that the recovery of the victim is from a vehicle in which the petitioner was also found.

Considering the rival submissions, this Court, for the present, is not inclined to allow the petitioner's prayer for bail. The same is rejected.

This Court would expect that the petitioner's counsel would honour his undertaking in the instant proceedings regarding supply of the requisite court fee etc.



within two weeks from the date he is called upon to do so by
the office.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

PNM

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

