

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19882 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-224 Year-2021 Thana- BAKHARI District- Begusarai

1. Dharmendra Das @ Dharmendra Tanti Son Of Debu Das R/O Village- Balha, P.S.- Dandari, District- Begusarai
2. Manish Kumar @ Manish Das Son Of Mahendra Das R/O Village- Salauna, P.S.- Bakhari, District- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bipin Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Raj Kishore Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

3 02-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and

learned APP for the State.

The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in

a case registered for the offences punishable under

Sections 406, 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case in nutshell is that one

year ago, the petitioners have taken away the husband

of the informant to Orissa to earn his livelihood. By

telephonic conversation, the husband of the informant

told the informant that the petitioners did not give him

labour charges and also he was assaulted by them. It is



further alleged that after sometime the informant was unable to talk to her husband and when she contacted with the petitioners and inquired about her husband, she did not get proper reply.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners are innocent and has committed no offence in the manner as alleged. It is further submitted that the petitioners are not contractor and they are not concerned with affairs of the informant and her husband. It is also submitted that there is no document or evidence supported about the taking away of husband of the informant by the petitioners.

Learned A.P.P appearing on behalf of the State has vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioners for anticipatory bail and submitted that from the perusal of the case diary vide para 5,6,7,8 all the proposed prosecution witnesses have stated about the involvement of these two accused petitioners in the commission of crime. It is also submitted that the husband of the



informant is not traced out yet.

Considering the above-stated facts, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners stands rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

nirajkrs/-

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

