

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2960 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-203 Year-2023 Thana- HATHAURI District- Muzaffarpur

Aditya Kumar @ Aditya Shahi S/o Ravindra Singh R/o Village- Amma, P.S.-
Hathauri, Distt.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashank Shekhar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 4 08-05-2025 1. Heard learned Senior counsel for the petitioner Mr. N.K. Agrawal and learned A.P.P. for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Hathauri P.S. Case No.203/2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 363, 366 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that her minor daughter, aged 16 years was missing since 20.09.2023, thus alleges that the accused persons including the petitioner enticed her and took her away.
4. The learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated



in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that the victim and the petitioner were in love and the victim on her own volition left her house but then under parental pressure, her statement under section 164 Cr.P.C. was recorded, wherein she supported the case of the prosecution with respect to the petitioner but then does not allege that any physical abuse was committed.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that what is not disputed rather stands admitted is that victim is a minor. It is further submitted that the statement of the victim was recorded under section 164 Cr.P.C., wherein she has supported the prosecution case with regard to the role of petitioner in kidnapping. It is also submitted that even presuming what has been submitted by the learned Senior counsel for the petitioner to be true without admitting but then the victim was a minor and the petitioner being a major ought not to have indulged in such an act. It is further submitted that if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner that will send a wrong message to the society.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of



anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is
rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

