

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59264 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-150 Year-2024 Thana- GAYA MUFASIL District- Gaya

1. Anuj kumar Son of Lekha yadav R/o Village- Maha Bigha, P.O.- Tankuppa, P.S.- Tankuppa, District- Gaya
2. Chhotu Kumar Son of Naresh Prasad Yadav R/o Village- Tirma, Post- Bhore, P.S.- FAtchpur, District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Tej Narayan Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Matloob Rab

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 12-09-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Muffasil Gaya PS Case No. 150 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 365 and 366 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he was married to Ruby in the year 2009 and out of the wedlock, two children were born, further petitioners in his absence abducted his wife along with the children, next alleges that it appears that his wife has been abducted for some immoral



purposes, further the petitioners always assure that she is safe but do not allow him to meet.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioner No. 1 is brother-in-law (bahnoi) of the victim and petitioner No. 2 had negotiated the marriage of the victim with the informant as such they have been falsely implicated in the instant case.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that it absolutely does not stand to reason that how petitioner No. 2 could have been a mediator of the marriage of the informant with the victim when presently he is aged about 23 years and the marriage of the informant with the victim took place in the year 2009. It is thus submitted that on a bald plea, the petitioners are trying to take anticipatory bail. It is further submitted that even the victim has not been recovered till date and the informant has not implicated any other family members of the victim rather has specifically alleged against the petitioners of their role in abduction of his wife with the children. It is submitted at the cost of repetition that victim till date has not been recovered.



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

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

