

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 3609 of 2025

 Kishan Lal Agrawal, S/o Late Girdhari Lal Agrawal, R/o Ward No.-08, Bhorki P.O.
 Bhorki, P.S. Gudhagaudji, District- Jhunjhunu (Rajasthan).

.... Petitioner(s).

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

... Opp. Party(s).

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

 For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Anjani Kumar, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Shashi Kumar Verma, Addl. P.P.

.....

04 / 08.07.2025: Heard, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. This anticipatory bail application under Sections 482 and 484 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been preferred by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Adityapur P.S. Case No.259 of 2019, for offences under Sections 363, 366-A/34 of the Indian Penal Code. The case is presently pending before the Court of Learned C.J.M., Seraikella.

3. It is alleged that the daughter and two month old infant of the informant were missing. After searching, the informant found a letter on 22.07.2019, in which his daughter wrote that she had been kidnapped by Chandan Mandal, Suman Mandal, Shobha Mandal, and Nehar Ray, and they might be near Rourkela Railway Station, Odisha. The informant also mentioned that earlier, on 05.12.2017, Chandan Mandal had kidnapped his daughter and sold her to the petitioner and his son Mukesh Agarwal in Rajasthan for Rs.5,00,000. She was later rescued on 06.12.2019 with the help of Delhi Mahila Ayog and Rajasthan Mahila Ayog. After that, Mukesh Agarwal allegedly threatened to kill the informant over the phone.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is completely innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that the FIR was lodged after one and half year of the incident

without stating any reason for the delay. He further submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. He further submits that the daughter of informant is a major girl and statement of the victim was recorded under section 164 of Cr.P.C in which she contradicted her own statement. He further submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. The learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the petitioner is not entitled to the privilege of anticipatory bail. He further submits that in her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C, the victim said that the accused kidnapped her, kept her confined, and forced her to marry son of the petitioner, Mukesh Agarwal.

6. After hearing the parties and from the perusal of the impugned order, I find that the allegation against the petitioner is serious in nature. Having considered the nature and seriousness of the allegations, particularly the statement of the victim recorded under Section 164 CrPC, and the fact that the petitioner is accused of participating in the kidnapping and illegal confinement of the daughter of the informant, this Court is of the view that the petitioner does not deserve the protection of anticipatory bail.

Hence, the court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to him.

7. Accordingly, this Anticipatory Bail Application stands **dismissed**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)