

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30926 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1054 Year-2019 Thana- MUZAFFARPUR TOWN District-
Muzaffarpur

=====

DINESH SAHNI SON OF LATE DHANAI SAHNI R/O- MOHALLA-
SIKANDARPUR, AKHARAGHAT ROAD P.S.- TOWN, DIST.-
MUZAFFARPUR

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chandra Shekhar Anand

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms Shaheen Begum

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 08-02-2023 Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove

all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one

month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as

learned APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with

Muzaffarpur P.S. Case No. 1054 of 2019, registered for the

offences punishable under Sections 363, 366 (A)/34 of the Indian

Penal Code.

As per allegation, the daughter of the informant who is

aged about 15 years went to purchase milk but she did not return.

During search, the petitioner came to know that the co-accused

Vikram Kumar had kidnapped the daughter of the informant and

the petitioner and other accused persons were also involved in that

kidnapping.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the

victim was recovered from the house of co-accused Vikram Kumar



and in her statement recorded under Section 161 of the Cr.P.C., she did not support the case against the petitioner but in her statement recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C., she retracted from her statement under Section 161 and named the petitioner.

On the other hand, the learned Addl.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that in paragraph No. 42 of the case diary, the statement of the victim under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. has been recorded in which she has stated that one person forcibly administered her some intoxicant. It appeared to her that it was Dinesh Sahni (the petitioner). She has further mentioned that he is a toddy seller and he has committed such type of incidents fourth time.

In my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time provided in para-1 hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

SONALI/-

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

