

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.27905 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-181 Year-2017 Thana- MOHANIYA District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Sonu Kumar @ Sonu Bhat @ Sonu S/O Late Nanhak Bhat Resident of
Village- Bishupur Mahurar, P.S.- Shahpur, District Bhojpur at Ara

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Pratap Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 07-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 366(A) of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that her minor daughter aged about 15-16 years was enticed by the petitioner and taken away.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioner and the victim were in love and the victim on her own volition left the house of the informant. It is also submitted that petitioner and the victim



performed their marriage and out of the wedlock a child was born who presently is aged about six years.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Rabindra Kumar, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the case is of the year 2017 and the statement of the victim was recorded in the year 2024 under Section 164 Cr.P.C. wherein the victim disclosed her age as 22 years, as such, in the year 2017 when the occurrence was committed, the victim was in between 15-16 years, the learned APP fairly submits that the victim in her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. has not supported the case of the prosecutions, as has been recorded in the order impugned, but then it is submitted that when the occurrence took place, the victim was a minor.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the said submission of the learned APP, but then submits that already out of the wedlock, a child was born who presently is aged about six years, as such the Court should show compassion.

7. The Court is in agreement with the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, thus, is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail



application stands rejected.

9. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner surrenders on or before 23.05.2025, the learned Trial Court shall dispose of the bail application of the petitioner on the same day keeping in mind the facts recorded hereinabove.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

