

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.84649 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-303 Year-2023 Thana- BAHERI District- Darbhanga

Manish Kumar @ Manish Prasad Singh Son of Vikneshwar Singh @
Vikneshwar Prasad Singh @ Bikneshwar Prasad Singh Resident of Village -
Mattharahi, Police Station- Baheri, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nilendu Kumar Choudhary, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Rina Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 21-03-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection
with Baheri P.S. Case No. 303 of 2023 for the offence
punishable u/s 364A and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner took the
grand son of the informant with him and thereafter a call was
received by the mother of the child making ransom demand.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this
case as he is agnate of the informant and also next door
neighbour. The child was recovered within four hours and the
person who was taking the child with him was apprehended.



This co-accused used the mobile phone and motorcycle in the occurrence and the petitioner has no relation with the said co-accused Manoj Yadav. The statement of the victim boy was recorded who stated that he went with the petitioner who took him to some hotel of his friend and left him behind. Thereafter, he was taken to some other place by another person from where the said child was rescued. From the statement of the victim boy it is also apparent that the petitioner has no role as the petitioner took the boy to the chowk for recharging the mobile of his mother and thereafter, he has no idea how the child was kidnapped. The petitioner is having clean antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner who submits that from paragraph Nos. 104 and 105 of the case diary it is evident that the petitioner was in regular touch with the person who was apprehended and the call details report of the mobile phones of these two persons discloses this fact. Moreover it was the petitioner who took the grandson of the informant in the hotel of his friend and conveniently left him behind.

6. In the light of nature of allegation and material available on record, I do not think it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



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

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

Prakash/-

U			
---	--	--	--

