

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5267 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-16 Year-2020 Thana- SASARAM MUFFSIL District- Rohtas

1. SURESH CHANDRAVANSHI S/o Late Lalu Kahar R/o village- Shivpur Chitauli, P.S.- Sasaram (Mufasil), District- Rohtas at Sasaram
2. Indravaso Devi W/o Suresh Chandravanshi R/o village- Shivpur Chitauli, P.S.- Sasaram (Mufasil), District- Rohtas at Sasaram
3. Kavita Kumari D/o Suresh Chandravanshi R/o village- Shivpur Chitauli, P.S.- Sasaram (Mufasil), District- Rohtas at Sasaram

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 6514 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-16 Year-2020 Thana- SASARAM MUFFSIL District- Rohtas

DEEPAK KUMAR S/O SURESH CHANDRAVANSHI RESIDENT OF
VILLAGE-SHIVPUR CHITAUULI, P.S SASARAM MUFASIL DISTRICT-
ROHTAS AT SASARAM

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 5267 of 2021)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ashutosh Tripathy

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Harish Singh
Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 6514 of 2021)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ashutosh Tripathy

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Suresh Prasad Singh

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

ORAL ORDER

6 09-02-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioners is directed to

remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within

one month.



Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State through video conferencing.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest for the offences alleged under Sections 366(A)/34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered in connection with Sasaram (Mufasil) P.S. Case No. 16 of 2020.

The informant Ram Pravesh Singh lodged the FIR, stating therein that the petitioner of Cr.Misc. No.6514 of 2021 Deepak Kumar and his sister Kavita Kumari, the daughter of the petitioner no.1 of Cr. Misc. No.5267 of 2021 Suresh Chandravanshi, took the informant's minor daughter, who is still traceless. In the later portion of the FIR, it has been mentioned that the accused persons have already been indulged in similar kind of offence of kidnapping.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the FIR was lodged after 12 days of the occurrence. He has also submitted that the informant himself had concealed his daughter and lodged this fabricated case against the petitioners. He has next submitted that both the parties have compromised the case.

The learned counsel for the informant has submitted that the reason for delay in lodging the FIR is that the informant



was in search of his daughter. He has also submitted that the victim is still traceless. He has next submitted that as per his instruction the compromise was entered into between the parties after applying threat and coercion.

Considering the fact that the victim is still traceless and the investigation is going on, I do not think it a fit case for anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioners of both the cases is hereby rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioners within the stipulated time provided hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

