

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49458 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-66 Year-2025 Thana- RAFIGANJ District- Aurangabad

Sonu Ram @ Sonu Kumar @ Gunjan Kumar S/o Ram Pravesh Ram @
Prawesh Ram R/o vill - Jain Bigha, P.S.- Rafiganj, Distt.- Aurangabad, Bihar
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Lalbahadur Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Kumar Ranjit Ranjan, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4 10-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Rafiganj P.S. Case No. 66 of 2025, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 87 and 140(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that minor daughter of the informant went missing and later it came to light that she had married the petitioner and would not return to her home.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that there is delay of 15 days in lodging the FIR. The petitioner and the



victim girl were in a mutual relationship. The victim girl has stated nothing against the petitioner in her statement recorded under Section 180 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and she has further stated that she voluntarily left her house and travelled to Hyderabad with the petitioner. It is further submitted that the victim has denied for her medical test. The petitioner is in custody since 01.03.2025 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that the victim is a minor girl and she has admitted the fact that they have solemnized marriage in Hyderabad. It is further submitted that there is specific allegation against the petitioner of luring informant's daughter and performing marriage with her. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

