

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20201 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2025 Thana- CHANAN District- Lakhisarai

Nitish Kumar Son of Ramdeo Mandal Resident of Village - Gopalpur, P.S. -
Chanan, District - Lakhisarai

... .. Petitioner/s
Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Priyanka Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 09-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Chanan
P.S. Case No. 19 of 2025 instituted for the offences under
Sections 137(2), 96 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Accusation against the petitioner is of luring away
the victim girl on the pretext of marriage.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case.
Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that victim in her



Statement recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. has specifically stated that she left her house on her own sweet will and this petitioner never gave any compulsion or threat to her. Learned counsel further submitted that victim has solemnized marriage with the petitioner on her own sweet will. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 12.02.2025 and has one criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that victim is minor and her consent has no value in the eye of law. Learned APP further submitted that medical report of the victim also corroborates the allegation as levelled in the FIR. Police after investigation submitted charge-sheet under Sections 137(2), 96 of the BNS and 4/6 of the POCSO Act.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as also since the allegation against the petitioner as levelled in the FIR is substantiated by the medical evidence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.



9. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for grant of bail before the Trial Court if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

