

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24450 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-148 Year-2024 Thana- KURSAILA District- Katihar

Md. Hasib Ansari @ Hasib Ansari Son of Md. Hanif Ansari village- M.T. tola,
Devipur, ps- Kursela, Dist- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raj Kishor Prasad

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Chandra Bhushan Prasad- A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 103(1), 3(5) of B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant
alleges that on 04.08.2024 at 9.00 P.M., her minor daughter aged
about 10 years went behind the DJ, which was being performed
in a Nikah, but when the victim did not return home till late in
night, search was made and the informant along with other went
to the house of Md. Mursil where Nikah ceremony was taking
place, but informant was not allowed entry in the house by Md.
Mursil. Accordingly, police was informed on 05.08.2024 and on



06.08.2024, the dead body of the minor was recovered from a place behind the house of Md. Mursil. Further alleges that after seeing the dead body, it was obvious that the victim was raped and murdered and the body was dumped in water and thus, alleges that Md. Mursil, Golu Ansari, Chhagli Khatoon along with unknown accused committed the occurrence.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in the FIR and the thrust of the allegation is against Md. Mursil, Golu Asnsari and Chhagli Khatoon. It is also submitted that it was Md. Mursil, who did not allow the informant to enter the house when she had gone in search of the victim. It is further submitted that the name of the petitioner transpired during the course of investigation.

5. Learned A.P.P. Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that a child aged about 10 years was brutally murdered and her dead body was thrown in water. It is next submitted that no doubt, the petitioner is not named in the FIR, but then, during the course of investigation, his name transpired and the investigation of the case is in its nascent stages and the offence is heinous, as such, it is not a case where this Court should exercise its discretion in



granting anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

