

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2048 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-429 Year-2023 Thana- MURLIGANJ District- Madhepura

Navneet Kumar S/O Prabhu Yadav Resident of Village- Digghi, Ward No. 01,
P.S- Murliganj, District- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, Adv. Mr. Manoj Kumar, Adv. Ms. Pooja Prasad, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Md. Iftekhar Mahmood, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 25-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 365, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The FIR has been lodged by the father of the victim boy Badal Kumar who has stated that the victim had left the house on 22.09.2023 to meet one Lalu Kumar whereafter he did not come back home. It is stated that for 2-3 days, the informant kept on searching for him and then gave a *sanha* in the Police Station on 24.09.2023. It has further been stated that one day prior to his going missing, he had a dispute with one Chhotu Kumar and with regard to the petitioner, it is stated that he was also there along with 4-5 other miscreants. The further



allegation made in the FIR is that the petitioner along with Chhotu Kumar had threatened the son of the informant several times.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a perusal of the FIR would itself go to show that a *sanha* with regard to the missing of the victim was made after three days of the occurrence and no suspicion was raised with regard to the complicity of the petitioner in the same. It would further appear from the FIR that the victim had left the house to meet one Lalu Kumar and there was a dispute, one day prior to his going missing, with one Chhotu Kumar. However, if the informant had such information about any dispute having occurred with Chhotu Kumar along with this petitioner and about the threatening, there is no reason why the FIR would not have been lodged earlier with such allegations against the petitioner and others. It is further submitted that there is no eye-witness to occurrence and it is not even a case of last seen with the petitioner. During the course of investigation also, nothing substantial has been revealed in order to connect the petitioner to the said offence.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail.



6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the clean antecedent of the petitioner, I am inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the Court below within four weeks, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned J.M. 1st Class, Madhepura in connection with Murliganj P.S. Case No. 429 of 2023, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C/ 482 (2) of the BNSS, 2023.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

divyanshi/-

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

