

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46120 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-3 Year-2024 Thana- BALIGAON District- Vaishali

Rahul Kumar Son of Panna Lal Sahni R/O Vill- Rampur Keshopatti, P.S.-
Muffasil, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Chandeshwar Sah Son of Dhong Sah Resident of village- Ladaho, P.O.-
beladam, P.S. Baligaon, District- Vaishali

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajeev Ranjan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

3 11-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Baligaon P.S. Case No.3/2024, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 363, 365 and 34 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 his minor granddaughter aged about 17 ½ years went
outside the house informing that she was going to college but did
not return, accordingly, a search was made but the victim could not
be located, later the informant came to know that petitioner used to
call her on her mobile number, accordingly he went to the house of
the petitioner but no one was present in the house, as such based



on suspicion alleges that petitioner along with Manju Devi, Hira Lal Sahni, Panna Lal Sahni and Anjali Kumari kidnapped his granddaughter.

4. Learned counsel 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 they eloped. It is also submitted that the statement of the victim was recorded under section 161 Cr.P.C. and 164 Cr.P.C., wherein she has stated that she had accompanied the petitioner to Delhi. It is further submitted that the victim did not allege that petitioner in any manner committed any wrong with her.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that victim on the date of occurrence was a minor, as such an offence has been committed and it is a good case for regular bail.

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	
---	--	---	--

