

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18953 of 2025

Arising out of PS. Case No.-714 Year-2024 Thana- NAUBATPUR District- Patna

Neeraj Kumar, S/o Dinesh Kumar, Resident of Vill- Amarpura, P.S.- Naubatpur, District- Patna (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vinod Pandey, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s: Mr. Satya Nand Shukla, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 03-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the state.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case instituted for the offences under Sections 137(2) and 96/34 of the BNS. He has no criminal antecedent.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has alleged that his daughter namely Suman Kumari was not found in her room, thereafter, she started looking for her. He got an information that his daughter had some connection with the petitioner, Neeraj Kumar and his associates namely Rahish Kumar. The informant has suspected that it was the petitioner who was responsible for the disappearance of his daughter, hence, the present FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case and it was merely on suspicion he has been named in the present case. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the victim girl namely Suman Kumari was recovered and she in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNS has categorically stated that she had fled away with one Ved Raj and had also solemnized marriage and they are happily living together. Learned counsel for the petitioner further draws attention of this Court that from reading of the statement recorded under Section 183 BNS it would be evident that she has not alleged anywhere against the petitioner. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent and is in custody since 15.11.2024.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and has submitted that the petitioner was an accomplice of the main accused Ved Raj who had helped the victim in fleeing away as such the petitioner should not be released on bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions of the parties and also considering the period of custody of the petitioner and the statement of the victim girl recorded under Section 183 BNS, the petitioner above named, is directed to be released on



bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned ACJM-VI/Court concerned, Danapur in connection with Naubatpur P.S. Case No. 714 of 2024, subject to the the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors will be a close relative of the petitioner.

(ii) The petitioner will remain present on each and every date fixed by the Court below, if so required by the learned Trial Court.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be canceled by the Court concerned.

(iv) And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms



of the above-mentioned order shall not be de-
layed for purpose of the same or in the name of
verification.

7. It is made clear that the observations, if any,
made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Vikash/-

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

