

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26600 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2019 Thana- GOVINDPUR District- Nawada

PURUSHOTAM KAHAR S/O LATE JAGDISH KAHAR, R/O VILLAGE-
CHOTHA, POLICE STATION-RAJAULI, DISTRICT-NAWADA.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Birendra Kumar, Advocate
For the informant	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Srivastava, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Binod Kumar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

5 12-05-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove
all the defects pointed out by the office within one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Govindpur P.S. Case No. 19 of 2019 registered for offence
punishable under section 384 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per allegation, the informant received a telephonic
call from an unknown number, i.e. 9525144175. The caller
demanded Rs.5,00,000/- as ransom and he threatened the
informant for dire consequences if he did not pay the demanded
money. Again on 29.01.2019, the informant received a call from
another mobile No. 9431716758. Again, he was threatened by the
person, who made call. The informant disclosed his name as
Dharmbir.



The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that co-accused, Manoj Kumar Mehta and Jaswant Kumar Mehta were arrested during the course of investigation and they disclosed the name of the present petitioner. He has also submitted that except confessional statement, there is nothing against the petitioner in the entire case diary.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for the informant has submitted that not only the miscreants demanded ransom from the informant, but due to non-fulfillment of the demand, the miscreants, including the petitioner attacked the family members of the informant in which the nephew of the informant died and in this respect, a separate case has been lodged. In that case also, the petitioner has been implicated as an accused. He has also submitted that it is an unauthorized gang and in pursuance of common intention, they committed offence.

Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, in my view, it is not a fit case for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Mahesh/-

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

