

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13758 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-223 Year-2017 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Surendra Kumar Son of Late Mahesh Ray Resident of Village - Naraha
(Mushari), P.S.- Tariyani, District - Sheohar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhishek Anand

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 12-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State, Shri Rabindra Kumar.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 223 of 2017 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 363, 366A and 34 of the
IPC.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and in sum and
substance the allegation is that minor daughter of the informant
aged about 14 years was kidnapped by the petitioner on 18-5-
2017 at 10 pm, while she was returning home from the house
Vilash Rai.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the



informant. It is next submitted that statement of the victim was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C, wherein she has not supported the case of the prosecution, rather has stated that she herself went to the house of her relative.

5. At this stage, the learned APP submits that from perusal of Annexure- P/3, it would manifest that petitioner had moved before the learned District Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing ABP No. 1574 of 2018 which got dismissed for default by an order dated 21-12-2018, as such petitioner was aware of the case, but then he did not take any steps thereafter and again in the year 2024, he filed ABP No. 31 of 2024 which was rejected by an order dated 26-4-2024, as such it is submitted that petitioner at his leisure is moving for seeking anticipatory bail. The learned APP thus submits that if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the same will send a wrong message that an accused can approach the High Court at any point of time for seeking anticipatory bail, more so, when the petitioner was completely aware that a case has been instituted against him as he had filed ABP No. 1574 of 2018.

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



anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

