

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11914 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-189 Year-2024 Thana- VAISHALI District- Vaishali

Saroj Kumar Son of Ravindra Paswan Resident of village -Majhaul Chak masjid, PS- Vaishali (Belsar Op) District -Vaishali at Hajipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Niranjan Parihar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Priya Sharan Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

5 17-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Vaishali (Belsar O.P.) P.S. Case No. 189 of 2024, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 363, 366, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, wife and daughter of the informant was kidnapped by the petitioner along with other co-accused persons with the intention to marry her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the victim



Spana Kumari has not supported the prosecution case and she has stated before the police that she was never kidnapped by the accused. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. No specific allegation has been attributed against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the allegation of kidnapping is false and concocted and no any occurrence has been done by the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 19.11.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submitted that there is specific allegation levelled against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the victim in her statement made under Section 161 Cr.P.C. and Section 164 of Cr.P.C. has levelled specific allegation against the petitioner. Cognizance has also been taken against the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from the date of receipt/production, the



petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the
Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

