

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19982 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-618 Year-2023 Thana- NARPATGANJ District- Araria

Dabloo Yadav@ Dabloo Kumar SON OF JAI NARAYAN YADAV
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- KHAIRA CHANDRA WARD NO. 7, PS-
NARPATGANJ, DIST- ARARIA Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mukesh Kumar Rana, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mohammed Arif, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 02-04-2024 Heard Mr. Mukesh Kumar Rana, learned counsel for
the petitioner and the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection with Narpatganj P.S. Case No. 618 of 2023 instituted under Sections 341, 323, 504, 506, 363, 366A of the Indian Penal Code lodged on 26.10.2023 by the informant, Mayanand Yadav.

3. As per the prosecution story, the allegation is that the informant's minor daughter was taken away by the petitioner alongwith the other accused on a Scorpio. Accordingly, the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits after return, the girl acknowledged under section 161 of the Cr.P.C. that she was in relationship with the petitioner and as parents were not ready, she left the house and solemnized the marriage with the petitioner in a temple. However, under section 164 of the Cr.P.C she gave entirely different version accusing the



petitioner of rape. Learned counsel further submits that he is a young boy pursuing studies and do not have criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP on the other hand opposes the prayer stating that the girl is minor and has accused the petitioner of kidnapping under section 164 of the Cr.P.C.

6. Though the petitioner is young boy and do not have criminal antecedent and in earlier version, the girl had narrated before the police that she left the place at her own, in view of the fact that under section 164 of the Cr.P.C. she made a statement about having been taken away by the petitioner and got her married to him, in the opinion of this Court, this is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail which is accordingly rejected.

7. However, if the petitioner surrenders without four weeks from today, the Court concerned shall take the aforesaid observation into consideration while taking decision on his bail application and dispose it of on the same day when the surrender cum bail application is filed.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

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

