

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39296 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-548 Year-2019 Thana- ARA NAWADA District- Bhojpur

Dr. Ravi Ranjan Kumar @ Dr. Ravi Ranjan Son of Late Om Prakash
Srivastav Resident of Village - New Karman Tola, P.S.- Ara Nawada, District
- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate
	:	Mr. Gopal Govind Mishra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Zainul Abedin, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 14-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to
remove the defect(s), as pointed out by the office, if any, within
a period of four weeks from today.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420 and
379 of the Indian Penal Code.

According to the prosecution case, co-accused,
namely, Guriya Devi has stolen the six month child of the
informant by cheating the mother of the informant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been



implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner has no concern with the child or the co-accused, namely, Guriya Devi.

The learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner on the basis of the material available on the record and the case diary submits that the child was recovered from the house of the petitioner.

He further submits that the co-accused, namely, Guriya Devi in her confessional statement (para 4 of the case diary) categorically stated that she has stolen child of the informant and sold the said child to the petitioner. She further states that the petitioner has paid approximately Rs. 2,00,000/- for the child. On the basis of the statement of the co-accused, the child was recovered from the house of the petitioner and the co-accused has been granted bail by the Court of Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ara under Section 167 of the Cr.P.C. He further submits that as per perusal of the aforesaid which itself shows that the petitioner has actively participated in the alleged occurrence. Hence, the petitioner may not be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of



anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

vanisha/-

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

