

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17796 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-153 Year-2023 Thana- KHODAWANDPUR District- Begusarai

Bimlesh Tripathi @ Bimlesh Tibari, aged about 33 years, Male, Son Of Lalan Tiwari, Resident of Village + Post-Sakri, Police Station Kudra, District Kaimur (Bhabhua)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dinesh Maharaj, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND MALVIYA

ORAL ORDER

6 29-11-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrested in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 419, 420, 341, 342, 323, 384, 386 and 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, the informant has alleged that the petitioner regularly called her husband and promised to help him in getting employment in a private company. It is further alleged that on the pretext of providing a job, the petitioner kidnapped her husband and thereafter demanded ransom of Rs. 6,00,000/-. It is further alleged that the informant received many calls where she was threatened for the



life of her husband.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case due to grudge and malice. He next submits that the petitioner is working as a Security Guard at Pune, Maharashtra and he was asked by a co-villager, Amarjeet Prajapati to transfer a sum of Rs. 50,000/- to the account of one Adarsh Kumar. He submits that he has been made an escape goat as he had no knowledge about the alleged offence being committed by the co-accused Amarjeet Prajapati and others, and he had no intention to commit such crime, as stated in para-7 of the petition.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the anticipatory bail for the petitioner and he submits that there is a direct allegation against the petitioner that he promised a job to the informant's husband and on the pretext of the same, he kidnapped him and demanded ransom.

6. On perusal of the first information report, case diary, antecedent report of the petitioner and the impugned order dated 22.01.2024, it appears that petitioner regularly called the informant's husband and promised to help him in getting employment in a private company and on the pretext of the same, the petitioner kidnapped her husband and demanded



ransom of Rs. 6,00,000/- (Rupees six lakhs). It appears from the impugned order that one co-accused Adarsh Kumar, stated in his confessional statement that the petitioner is his friend and that he called the informant’s husband promising to provide him a job. It also appears from the supplementary case diary that the alleged amount of Rs.50,000/- was sent to the account of the petitioner from the informant and it was withdrawn by the petitioner immediately, so considering all aspects of the matter, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Brajesh Kumar/-

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

