

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20113 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2021 Thana- KOPA District- Saran

-
1. ANUP KUMAR @ ANUP RAM SON OF DHUPLAL RAM R/O-HATHISAR, P.S.-MARHOWRAH, DISTT.-SARAN
 2. SATISH KUMAR SON OF CHANDRAMA RAM R/O-RAMPUR, P.S.-EKMA, DISTT.-SARAN

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar Singh No. I
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nitya Nand Tiwary

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 04-10-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Kopa P.S. Case No. 47 of 2021 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 366/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, there is allegation that petitioners and others abducted informant's daughter on the point that informant met an accident and calling her name repeatedly and thereafter she left with the petitioners and others.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence as



alleged in the FIR and they have falsely been implicated in this case. Learned counsel further submits that the victim has gone outside of her house by her own will and no such type of occurrence has ever taken place but a false and concocted case has been lodged. Petitioners bear no criminal antecedent.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners by contending that under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. victim clearly stated that her consent was taken on the point that her mother met an accident and calling her name repeatedly and when she accompanied with the petitioners and others, Samosa was provided to her by them and after consuming Samosa she became faint and after regaining her consciousness she found herself in a close room. He further submits that having similar allegation, bail prayer of co-accused Rahul Kumar and Jitendra Ram has already been rejected by this court vide Cr. Misc. No. 43353 of 2022 and hence, petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation levelled against the petitioners coupled with statement of victim recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. as well as material available on record, I am not inclined to



grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.
Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is
hereby rejected.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

shahzad/-

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

