

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15976 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-32 Year-2014 Thana- PHULPARAS District- Madhubani

BHAGWAN JHA Son of Kripanand Jha Resident of Village- Sijouliya, P.S.-
Phulparas, District- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mohammed Arif, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

3 12-01-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is expected to honour his undertaking given in the instant case for depositing the requisite court fee and to remove the defect(s) as pointed out by the office when called upon to do so by the office.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Phulparas P.S. Case No. 32 of 2014 corresponding to G.R. No.129 of 2014 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 366(A)/34 of the Indian Penal Code, which is pending before ACJM-II, Jhanjharpur (Madhubani).

It is a case of kidnapping of the victim lady, namely, Rekha Kumari with the help of three miscreants.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner



that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that the petitioner has got clean antecedent.

Learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

From perusal of the case diary, it is apparent that the victim in her statement recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. in para-218 has stated that seven years earlier the petitioner had forcibly taken away the victim from her house and kept at Delhi in a closed room for two years, in the meantime, he assaulted her and he forcefully solemnized marriage with her in a temple and anyhow she ran away from the clutch of the petitioner and came to the house of her parents. She has further stated that the petitioner was a married person from earlier and she expressed her desire to live at her parents' house, as such, it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

brajesh kumar/-

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

