

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16039 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-16 Year-2025 Thana- BIDUPUR District- Vaishali

Satendra Singh @ Netaji @ Satyendra Singh S/O Late Ganesh Singh R/O
Vill.- Madhurapur, P.S.- Bidupur, Dist.- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ramchandra Sahni, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2),
140(3) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that her husband Ratnesh had come to his village on 05.08.2024
from Madhurapur and her husband does not have a mobile,
further on 09.09.2024, petitioner called her on her mobile and
informed that her husband is well, next alleges that her mother-
in-law suffered fracture of leg, on account of which, she became
involved with her, further when she did not get any information
about her husband for a long time, the informant came to the



village Madhurapur on 30.12.2024 but did not find her husband, thus enquired from petitioner who started evading, thus alleges that her husband was abducted in connivance with the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant based on suspicion. It is next submitted that from perusal of the FIR, it would manifest that the date of occurrence is 09.09.2024 and the FIR came to be instituted on 07.01.2025. It is next submitted that it does not appear probable that informant being wife of the victim would not have made endeavour to know about the whereabouts of the victim when she was aware that he does not carry mobile. It is also submitted that the informant could have called to the petitioner after 09.09.2024 if the victim was not contacting her. It is next submitted that though informant in the FIR alleges that she got involved with her mother-in-law who suffered fracture of leg but then that itself by no stretch of imagination could be construed to have given an excuse to the informant of not trying to find out the whereabouts of her husband. It is next submitted that entire allegation hinges around suspicion. It is further submitted that FIR does not even remotely suggest that there was any dispute in between petitioner and the victim.



5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that no doubt the petitioner has been implicated in the instant case based on suspicion but then from the FIR it is admitted that the victim is traceless and the investigation of the case is continuing and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond, on which, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Bidupur P.S. Case No.16/2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) B.N.S.S.

7. However, it is made clear that in the event if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned trial court bringing to its notice that the petitioner



despite giving assurance to this court is not co-operating in the investigation in that event the learned trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

8. It is further made clear that the present anticipatory bail order shall come to an end, in the event, if charge sheet is submitted against the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

