

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23067 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-464 Year-2023 Thana- KANTI District- Muzaffarpur

1. Sudhir Kumar Son Of Sudama Mahto Resident Of Village - Godai Phulkahan, P.S. - Kanti, District - Muzaffarpur
2. Satrugghan Mahto Son Of Lal Bahadur Mahto Resident Of Village - Godai Phulkahan, P.S. - Kanti, District - Muzaffarpur
3. Deb Kali Devi Wife Of Sudama Mahto Resident Of Village - Godai Phulkahan, P.S. - Kanti, District - Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Kumari Chandana
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rana Randhir Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 4 09-09-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners Ms. Kumari Chandana, and learned APP for the State.
2. The petitioners seeks bail in anticipation of their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 363 and 366(a)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are person with clean antecedent and petitioner no. 3 is a woman and the informant alleges that her daughter aged about 18 years along with Sundari went missing from the preceding night of 21.06.2023. Further, in course of search, it transpired that Puja, Kusmi and Deb Kali have kidnapped them



for purposes of marriage.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioner nos. 1 and 2 are not named in the FIR and they came to be implicated in the statement of victim recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C.

5. The learned APP for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that victim Khushboo was recovered and her statement was recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. wherein she has supported the case of the prosecution and has also stated that she along with her cousin sister were administered some psychotropic substance and the accused persons tried to sell them, as has been recorded in the order impugned.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J.)

Sudhanshu/-

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

