

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35226 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-52 Year-2021 Thana- DHURAIYA District- Banka

NIPESH KUMAR SON OF YADUNANDAN KAPRI R/O- VILL.-
KUSHMAHA P.O.- AHIRO P.S.- DHORAIYA, DIST.- BANKA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arjun Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Veena Rani Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 29-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 366(A) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that the petitioner along with accused persons kidnapped her minor daughter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that the victim and Dhermendra were in love and they elope and the informant falsely implicated the petitioner along with the family members of Dhermendra, it is next



submitted that mother of Dhermendra has been granted anticipatory bail by order dated 18.02.2022 in Cr. Misc. No. 53266 of 2021. The learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that petitioner is not related to Dhermendra in any manner rather is a co-villager.

Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that though it has been submitted that petitioner is not related to Dhermendra, but then the same has not been pleaded in the anticipatory bail application rather it is only an oral submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is also submitted that it appears that the girl till date is traceless or else the petition would have disclosed whether the victim has returned or not.

Considering the submission made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Shivam/-

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

