

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 49913 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-96 Year-2023 Thana- KEWATI District- Darbhanga

1. Neelam Devi Wife of Ram Dayal Bhagat Resiedent of Vill- Maliya Tol, P.S.- Keoti, District- Darbhanga.
2. Ram Dayal Bhagat Son of Late Prabhu Ram Bhagat Resiedent of Vill- Maliya Tol, P.S.- Keoti, District- Darbhanga.
3. Ravi Kumar Son of Ram Dayal Bhagat Resiedent of Vill- Maliya Tol, P.S.- Keoti, District- Darbhanga.

... .. petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Girish Chandra Jha, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 18-12-2024 Heard Ld. counsel for the petitioners and

Ld. APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend his arrest in connection with Keoti P.S. Case No. 96 of 2023 dated 02.04.2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 363 and 365 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per allegation, the 18 year old son of the informant has been abducted and is still traceless.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that in the case diary there is no material collected, showing the complexity of the petitioners. Even there is history of the alleged victim of fleeing away from the house and the the accused persons are agnates of the victim.



There is admittedly land dispute between the parties, and hence, there is possibility of false implication.

5. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the petition that petitioners have never moved before this Hon'ble Court for grant of Anticipatory Bail or Regular one.

6. It has also been stated in paragraph no.3 of the bail petition that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents.

7. However, Ld. APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the petitioners for anticipatory bail submitting that the alleged offence is serious in nature and the child is still traceless and in view of the direct allegation that the petitioners are involved in the abduction of the child, the petitioners do not deserve anticipatory bail at this stage.

8. Considering the fact that the child is still traceless and there is direct allegation against the Petitioners, I am not persuaded to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

9. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners stands rejected.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

Chandan/-

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

