

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53631 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-131 Year-2018 Thana- JHAJHA District- Jamui

Karu Mandal @ Nabal Mandal, Son of Krishna Kumar Mandal R/o Village -
Pradhanchak, P.S.- Khaira, District - Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rewti Kant Raman

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 27-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Jamui P. S. Case No.131 of 2018 registered for the
offences punishable under Section 366(A) of the Indian Penal
Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that his wife was abducted by the accused
persons including the petitioner. It is next submitted that from
perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest
that FIR was instituted 15 days after the abduction of the wife of
the informant. It is next submitted that on the next day, the
victim came back.

4. It is submitted that it absolutely does not stand to



reason that if the wife of the informant was abducted why an FIR was not instituted promptly, which cast an aspersion on the case of the prosecution. It is also submitted that the victim was having an affair with Pintu Kumar.

5. Learned A.P.P. Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that the case is of the Year 2018 and the statement of the victim was recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. wherein she has supported the case of the prosecution and has stated that this petitioner was also involved in the occurrence of her abduction and she was taken to Bhagalpur where Sonu Mandal and Sintu Mandal raped her. It is further submitted that since there is an allegation against this petitioner also of abducting the victim, as such, it is not a fit case for grant of 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	
---	--	---	--

