

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32590 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-63 Year-2024 Thana- RAMNAGAR District- West Champaran

AMAR PARIT @ AMAR PADIT S/O Late Parsan Parit R/o Vill- Belwa
Mokari, P.S.- Ramnagar, Dist.- West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ramendra Kumar Bharti, Adv. Mr. Sanobar Shahnaz, Adv. Mr. Shahbaj Alam, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ajeet Kumar Bhardwaj, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH

ORAL ORDER

3 06-08-2025 Heard Mr. Ramendra Kumar Bharti learned counsel
for the Petitioner and Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Singh learned APP
for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Ramnagar P.S. Case No. 63 of 2024, dated 10.02.2024
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 363, 365,
364(A), 120(B) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of prosecution is that five year old son of
the informant (Shravan Sah) on 09.02.2024 at about 03:00 p.m.
went at Beli Belwa Chauk and did not return till late evening.
On search, informant could not trace his son, it has been alleged
by the informant that there is land dispute between the
informant and co-accused persons named in the FIR and they
might be behind the kidnapping of his son.



4. The main submissions advanced by the petitioner's counsel are that the petitioner has been made accused by the informant in respect of the offence of kidnapping of his minor son mainly on the basis of suspicion as in between them, there was a land dispute at the time of missing of the victim child, but he also suspected the co-accused Shambhu Pandit as being involved in the alleged occurrence of kidnapping and during the course of investigation, statement of the informant was recorded in which he revealed that when he inquired from the co-accused Shambhu Shah about location of his son then he stated that co-accused Mahadev Yadav and Kishore Yadav had taken his son on motorcycle, and in that revealment, the name of this petitioner did not come up. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 27.01.2025.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the informant has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the victim child has not been recovered till date and as per the statement made by the co-accused Mahadev Yadav and Shambhu Shah, the petitioner asked them to kidnap the informant's minor child, so, the alleged occurrence of kidnapping was committed as per the direction of this petitioner and further as per the disclosure made



by the said co-accused persons, the victim had been sold in Nepal.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions and mainly the seriousness of the occurrence which relates to kidnapping of a minor child and also the fact that the informant's relation with the petitioner was not good during the relevant time, though, he simply raised his suspicion against this petitioner but later on, during the course of investigation, the name of the petitioner surfaced as the main accused according to the co-accused persons, although, these statements were recorded by the police, however, the investigation for the recovery of the child is still pending, so, considering this aspect and also taking note of the five criminal antecedents of the petitioner, this court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail. If the trial of the petitioner has started then the Trial Court shall expedite the petitioner's trial and take steps to conclude the same as early as possible.

7. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

Siddharth Soni/-

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

