

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33951 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-48 Year-2010 Thana- EKMA District- Saran

Mridula Singh Wife of Late Ravindra Kumar Resident of - 52 Mahua Bag  
Town, PS- Rupaspur District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                                                            |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Sanjeev Ranjan, Adv.<br>Mr. Bijay Bhushan Prasad, Adv. |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Md. Iftekhar Mahmood, APP.                             |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

8      12-11-2024      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection with Ekma P.S. Case No. 48 of 2010 registered for the offences punishable under Section 366/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per FIR, on 28.03.2010, the sister of the informant went to Ekma Market, but did not return to her house. The informant also gave the information regarding the alleged occurrence in the police station. It is further alleged after two days, on 30.03.2010, the informant received a telephonic call from Mobile No. 9031068646 and came to know that holder of the said mobile number had abducted his sister. Later on, he came to know that user of that mobile number is Saurav Sahay,



who along with her companion Mridula Singh (petitioner) had kidnapped his sister.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. She has falsely been implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is totally false and based on concocted facts. She has no concern with the prime accused Saurav Sahay. Her name has been transpired in the present case merely on suspicion. Though it is true that SIM bearing no. 9204500608 was stand in the name of the petitioner, but the same was being used by her husband. On a fateful day, the mobile set having SIM bearing 9204500608 got lost on way for which the husband of the petitioner also reported to the police station on 22.09.2009 bearing SD No. 608 of 2009. Learned counsel further submits that the husband of the petitioner died in the year 2013 and now the petitioner is living at Patna with her children. She had no knowledge regarding the present case. During investigation, when the police came at her residential house on 27.12.2023, she came to know that she had been made accused in the present case. Thereafter without any delay, she filed bail petition before the



learned Court below and when her bail petition was rejected by the learned Court below, she moved before this Court for grant of anticipatory bail. It is further submitted that petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that there is serious allegation against the petitioner to kidnap the sister of the informant, who is still traceless. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and particularly the fact that the victim is still traceless, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

7. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the learned Court below within six weeks from today and seeks regular bail, the learned Court below shall pass order on the same day in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

**(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)**

divyanshi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

