

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48602 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-895 Year-2024 Thana- NAGAR District- Vaishali

=====

Mohammed Masum @ Md. Mosim @ Masum S/O Ganaur Shah @ Md. Ganaur @ Md. Gonaur Resident of Village- Bakhri, ward No. 10, P.S.- Musrigharari, Dist.- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shiv Sager Sharma, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Umanath Mishra, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND MALVIYA

ORAL ORDER

3 15-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his custody in connection with Hajipur (Town) P.S.Case No. 895 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2), 140(3), 61(2), 3(5) of BNS.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, petitioner who is the *Damaad* of the informant along with the other co-accused person have abducted to son of the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He next submits that informant had filed false case with the intention to pressurize the petitioner to give a share in the ancestral property.



He further submits that son of the petitioner has also lodged a missing report of the son of the informant at Government Railway Police Station, Ganjbasoda, vidisha (MadhyaPradesh) on 14.08.2024. He further submits that petitioner has clean antecedent.

5. However, learned APP for the State oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. On perusal of the FIR, entire case diary and impugned order dated 20.05.2025, it appears that the son of the informant has not been recovered as yet and he is still traceless. Moreover, investigation is still going on. It also appears that petitioner is the main culprit behind the crime and non bailable warrant has already been issued against the petitioner. So, considering the nature of allegation leveled against the petitioner, this case is not fit for anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

