

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59252 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-72 Year-2023 Thana- BARURAJ District- Muzaffarpur

Golu Kumar S/O Rajdeo Ray R/O Village- Sri Rampur Sirsiyan, P.S-
Kathaiya, Distt.- Muzafarpur.

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajeev Ranjan No.II, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Fahimuddin, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 06-12-2023 Heard Mr.Rajeev Ranjan No.II, learned counsel for
the petitioner, learned counsel for the informant and Mr.Md.
Fahimuddin, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Baruraj P.S.Case No.72 of 2023, FIR dated 03.04.2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 365/34 of IPC but the police, after investigation, submitted chargesheet under Sections 304(B), 120(B),201/34 of the IPC and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that on 02.04.2023, accused persons are alleged to have kidnapped the married daughter (the victim) of the informant. The informant suspected that her daughter was killed by the named accused persons.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. Petitioner is not named in the FIR. The name of the petitioner has been transpired during investigation on the basis of the confessional statement of the co-accused person, namely, Sikandra Rai. Further submits that even the petitioner is not the family members of the deceased and except the confessional statement of co-accused person, no other material has come during investigation against the petitioner to suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State, on other other hand, have vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that it has come during investigation that the petitioner was involved in the present occurrence and he was driver of the vehicle in question by which the dead body of the deceased was disposed of by the co-accused persons and the petitioner has participated in disposing of the dead body of the deceased.

6. Considering the aforesaid fact, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Baruraj P.S.Case No.72 of 2023 pending in the



court of learned C.J.M., Muzaffarpur.

7. Prayer is refused.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

