

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40707 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-901 Year-2024 Thana- BARH District- Patna

-
-
1. Dinesh Kumar S/O Late Durga Ram R/O Mohalla- Barh Bazar, Macharhatta, P.S- Barh, Dist.- Patna.
 2. Mintu Devi W/O Dinesh Kumar R/O Mohalla- Barh Bazar, Macharhatta, P.S- Barh, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dipak Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 03-09-2025 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Barh P.S. Case No. 901 of 2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 140(3)/96 of the B.N.S. Act.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he would not be pressing the anticipatory bail application with respect to petitioner No.1 and therefore, the anticipatory bail application with respect to petitioner No.1, namely, Dinesh Kumar, stands dismissed as withdrawn.

4. According to prosecution case, on 22.11.2024, the informant's daughter, Aditi Kumari alias Choti, did not return home after school. When the informant inquired at S.S. Girls High School, the Headmaster confirmed that all students had left after school hours. Later, the informant learned from people near



the school that four individuals, including the petitioners, took the girl away in a vehicle. Based on the written report of Seema Devi, a case was registered against the four accused on 23.11.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner No.2, namely Mintu Devi, is a housewife, has clean antecedent and her name is not mentioned in the F.I.R. and has no concern with the alleged occurrence / incident and only after two or three days, she learnt about the present occurrence, after having returned from worship at Vindhyanchal.

6. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail application.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts that petitioner No.2 is a lady and there is no direct implication or any incriminating materials having been surfaced against her during the course of investigation, let the petitioner No.2, above named, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M., Barh, in connection with Barh P.S. Case No. 901 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the



Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita and with other following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document to show his/her bona fide;

ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/her/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

sharun/-

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

