

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72945 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-152 Year-2024 Thana- CHAINPUR District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Santosh Bind @ Santosh Kumar Son of Budhu Bind Resident of village -
Mamhan, P.S.- Bhabua, District - Kaimur at Bhabua.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Basantu Bind Son of Rampyare Bind Resident of village - Lodipur, P.S.-
Chainpur, District - Kaimur at Bhabua.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajani Kant Pandey, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Iftekhhar Mahmood, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 24-10-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P.
for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Chainpur P.S. Case No. 152 of 2024 registered for the offences
punishable under Section 366(A), 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Allegedly, petitioner is said to have kidnapped the minor
daughter of the informant.

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. He has been
falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The
allegation levelled against the petitioner is totally false and
based on concocted facts. The matter of the fact is that when the



family members of the petitioner denied for solemnizing marriage between the informant's daughter and this petitioner, the present case has been lodged against the petitioner and his family members with a view to harass them. The medical report of the victim has not supported the prosecution case. There is no consistency in the statements of the informant and the victim girl. Learned counsel further submits 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 the statement of the victim has been recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. in which she has supported the prosecution case and stated against the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the statement of the victim recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

