

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40383 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-537 Year-2023 Thana- BATHNAHA District- Sitamarhi

1. Anjali Kumari @ Anjali Devi Wife of Dinesh Pandit Resident of Village -Ward no. 01,Gram and Post- Dighi, P.S.- Bathnaha, District -Sitamarhi.
2. Dinesh Pandit Son of Parikshan Pandit Resident of Village -Ward no. 01,Gram and Post- Dighi, P.S.- Bathnaha, District -Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Patna
2. Sita Devi Wife of Vijay Mahto Resident of village- Ward No. -1, Dighi, P.S.- Bathnaha, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar, Advocate  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh, A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      02-07-2024                      The pre-arrest bail application with regard to above named petitioner No. 2 has already been dismissed as withdrawn *vide* order dated 21.06.2024.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

3. Petitioner No. 1 apprehends arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 363, 366A/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 8 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act.

4. As per the prosecution case, on 11.12.2023, minor daughter of the informant had gone out of the village and in the



meantime, all the F.I.R. named accused persons including this petitioner kidnapped her for the purpose of marriage.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is next door neighbour of the informant and due to petty dispute this false and concocted case has been lodged against her. It is next submitted that the F.I.R. has been lodged after inordinate delay of four days. As a matter of fact, some dispute arose between daughter of the informant and daughter of co-accused Anil Pandit and Raushan Pandit and then she fled away to Delhi. Victim was finally recovered and in her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., she has not alleged anything wrong against the petitioner. Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this anticipatory bail is allowed and it is ordered that let the above named petitioner in the event of her arrest/surrender before the court below within a period of six weeks from today, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Additional Sessions Judge-VI-cum-Special Judge (POCSO Act), Sitamarhi in connection with Bathnaha P. S. Case No. 537 of 2023, subject to condition as laid down under



Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

**(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)**

Navya/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

