

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23234 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-68 Year-2025 Thana- Hattha District- Muzaffarpur

Vinod Rai @Vinod Kumar Son of Ramjatan Singh R/o Village - Loharkha
Piyar, P.S. - Hattha, Dist. - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Poonam Kumari
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Madhura Nand Jha

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 06-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Hattha P.S. Case No. 68 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2), 140(3), 3(5) of I.P.C.

3. The prosecution case is that the informant, Pawan Sahni, along with his wife Gudiya Devi and son Aryan Kumar, came to Muzaffarpur on 28.05.2025. About three months earlier, Gudiya Devi had allegedly paid Rs. 6,00,000/- to Manoj Rai for purchase of land. On 01.06.2025, Manoj Rai, Vinod Rai (the petitioner) and Vinita Devi allegedly took Gudiya Devi and her son on the pretext of discussing the land deal, after which they did not return. It is alleged that the accused persons had abducted them.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated. He is a person of clean antecedent. Co-accused Beenita Devi has been granted bail by a coordinate Bench of this Court. He has further submitted that FIR has been lodged after nine days of the occurrence.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail.

6. In the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of BNSS, she has categorically stated that the petitioner did wrong with her after lacing her drink with intoxicant due to which the victim fell unconscious. There is also statement to the effect that the petitioner along with co-accused Manoj Rai took the victim on a four-wheeler and later took her to Delhi where the wrongful act was committed with the victim by the petitioner. Considering the seriousness of the direct allegation against the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

kundan/-

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

