

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24619 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-209 Year-2024 Thana- PURAINI District- Madhepura

=====

Raja Kumar S/o Nirbhai Yadav R/o Vill- Fulaut, Ward No. 3, P.S.- Fulaut
(Chausa), Dist- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sharda Nand Mishra, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 17-07-2025 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P for the State.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Puraini P.S. Case No. 209 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable u/s 140(2) of the B.N.S.

3. As per the prosecution case, some unknown miscreants are alleged to have kidnapped the eight years-old grand son of the informant in day-light on the point of pistol from his school bus.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and his name has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that no T.I.P. has been conducted for the identification



of the petitioner to be involved in the said incident. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has one criminal antecedent and is in custody since 30.10.2024.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and has stated that from perusal of the case diary it is clear that the victim Mayank Ranjan was recovered on the basis of confessional statement of the petitioner and on his confession the weapons and cartridges used in the said incident have also been recovered, hence, he does not deserve the liberty of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and also taking into account the confessional statement of the petitioner leading to recovery of child, this court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the same is hereby rejected.

7. At this juncture the learned counsel for the petitioner informs that the petitioner is not keeping well in the jail and has also informed that proper treatment is not being rendered to the petitioner. In view of such submissions the learned Court below is directed to see to it that the petitioner is given proper treatment and if necessary, he may also be sent for better treatment to a bigger hospital, if the treatment is not



available at the local hospital.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Jyoti/-

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

