

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.27517 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-428 Year-2024 Thana- MURLIGANJ District- Madhepura

Mangen Rishideo S/O Late Puran Rishideo R/O Village- Pratapnagar, Ward
No. 2, P.S- Murliganj and Distt.- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dinesh Prasad Verma, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER**

4 27-08-2025 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

petitioner and learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with

Murliganj P.S. Case No. 428 of 2024 registered for the

offences under Sections 137(2) and 96 of the Bharatiya

Nyaya Sanhita.

3. The petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and is in

custody since 25.09.2024.

4. The allegation against the petitioner is to kidnap

the minor daughter of the informant along with other co-

accused persons/family members for the purpose of illicit

intercourse/marriage with other person. The age of minor



daughter of informant was 16 years on the date of occurrence which took place on 21.09.2024.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that daughter of informant due to love affairs with son of informant namely Ranjeet Kumar, left her house out of her own, but as their love affair was not approved by informant being parent of the victim, present false implication was raised making entire family accused and, therefore, petitioner being father was also implicated with the present case. It is submitted that despite the fact as petitioner remains in custody for about one year, not even single prosecution witness was examined and, therefore, there is all likelihood that trial of this case would not conclude within preferred time period of one year as available under Section 35(2) of the POCSO Act. While concluding the argument it is submitted that petitioner is a man of clean antecedent and moreover, investigation of this case has already completed, and as such, there is no chance of tampering with the evidence.

6. Learned APP appearing on behalf of the State,



while opposing the prayer for bail could not disputed aforesaid factual aspect.

7. In view of aforesaid factual submission and by taking note of fact as prima-facie implication of petitioner appears only being father of main co-accused Ranjeet Kumar, coupled with the fact as petitioner remains in custody since 25.09.2024, where trial of this case is not likely to conclude within preferred time line of one year as per Section 35(2) of the POCSO Act, accordingly above named petitioner, is directed to be released on bail in connection with Murliganj P.S. Case No. 428 of 2024 on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Madhepura/concerned court, subject to the conditions as mentioned under Section 480(3) of the B.N.S.S.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J.)

S.Tripathi/-

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

