

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15895 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-249 Year-2020 Thana- GHANSHYAMPUR District- Darbhanga

SUDAI LAL DEO @ SUDAI KUMAR LAL DEO S/O SABADI LAL DEO
R/o village- Atahar, P.S.- Baheri, District- Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Baidya Nath Prasad, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER**

2 12-01-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State through virtual court proceedings.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove the defects as pointed out by the office, within four weeks of resumption of normal court proceedings. In the eventuality of non-removal of defects within the undertaken period, the office will place the matter before the Bench.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case in connection with Ghanshyampur P.S. Case No.249 of 2020, registered for the offence punishable under Section 366(A)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with



other named co-accused have abducted the daughter and niece of the informant for the purposes of marriage/prostitution/sell. It is alleged that the accused persons threatened over call to not lodge any case, else the girls would be killed.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive and personal grudge. No such occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. The entire family member of the petitioner has been implicated in this case because earlier they have refused the proposal of the marriage of petitioner with the informant's daughter. It is submitted that there is an inordinate delay of 12 days in lodging the FIR without any plausible explanation for the same. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent, as also mentioned in para-3 of the anticipatory bail application.

Learned counsel for the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail by submitting that there is direct allegation of kidnapping of minor girls. Both the victims were recovered and in their statements u/s 164 Cr.P.C., both have supported the case of kidnapping by the petitioner.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner



named above. The prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby
rejected.

The instant application is dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

pallavi/-

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

