

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.62096 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-18 Year-2019 Thana- ALOULI District- Khagaria

MD. Shohrab S/o Md Hasib R/O Ward No 2, Village- Aurahi, P.S- Alauli,
District- Khagariya, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prabhat Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Md. Anzarul Haque Sahara, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 03-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Alauli P.S. Case No. 18 of 2019 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 365, 364 and 120-B of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner submits that he has obtained a certified copy of the
FIR and the same is being submitted.



4. The copy of FIR is taken on record, as such, the defect, as pointed out by the office, is hereby ignored.

5. It is next submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 18.01.2019 at about 11:00 AM, the petitioner called her husband from Mobile No. 9113719393, and thereafter her husband went to meet him on his motorcycle bearing Registration No. UP 14 CC 7435 and since then he is traceless.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant.

7. On query of the Court that as to whether the husband of the informant has returned or not, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the husband of the informant has not returned.

8. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the case is of the year 2019 and the husband of the informant since then is traceless and there is specific allegation in the FIR against the petitioner that it was he who called the husband of the informant and thereafter he left the house and became traceless.



9. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. **Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.**

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

