

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42162 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-431 Year-2022 Thana- KATRA District- Muzaffarpur

MD. RAJU MD. RABBANI RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- DARHAUL, PS-
KATRA, DISTT -MUZAFFARPUR

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anish Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-08-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 363, 366,
365, 120B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent.

4. The informant alleges that petitioner eloped with
her daughter and married her as is evident from the video and
thereafter entire family shifted to Calcutta, hence the informant
could not meet her daughter nor could go to Calcutta as her
husband was working abroad, it is next alleged that recently the
family members of the petitioner came to the village and on
inquiry, they flatly refused that her daughter was married to the



petitioner, thus, alleges that her daughter was abducted.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that it is not in dispute that the petitioner and the daughter of the informant eloped and married, it is next submitted that the petitioner had gone abroad for work where the informant had brought her daughter back and when he came to fetch her, she was missing and accordingly, he instituted Complaint Case No. 4549 of 2022 in the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur which is pending adjudication. It is next submitted that on the same day, the present FIR also came to be instituted.

6. Learned A.P.P., Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that it absolutely does not stand to reason that as to why the petitioner has not disclosed the date on which he went abroad for work when he came back, when he came to know that his wife is missing, it is next submitted that no mother would falsely implicate her own son-in-law knowing that her daughter went missing from her home.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to grant the privilege



of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

