

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59977 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-250 Year-2024 Thana- BEGUSARAI MUFFASIL District-
Begusarai

=====

Vijay Kumar Tanti @ Vijay Kumar S/O Mahendra Tanti R/O Village- Bharra,
P.O.- Suja, P.S.- Muffasil, District- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sandip Kumar Gautam, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Navin Kumar Pandey, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 250 of 2024 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 366A, 504 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 petitioner, who was tuition teacher of her minor
daughter, took her to the market on pretext of filling form, but
then she did not return.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the



informant. It is next submitted that no doubt petitioner was teacher of the victim but then they were in love and they eloped. It is also submitted that petitioner and the victim have performed their marriage. It is next submitted that victim came back and her statement was recorded under section 164 Cr.P.C, wherein she has not supported the case of the prosecution, rather has stated that she was in love with the petitioner and they eloped and performed their marriage, further that her mother wants the petitioner and the victim killed and her mother earlier had also got her father killed. The learned counsel thus submits that when victim has not supported the case of the prosecution, whether it would be prudent for the court to send the petitioner to jail, when victim is about 17 and half years of age, as such she had reached the age of discretion.

5. The learned APP vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that petitioner being teacher of the victim committed such an offence. It is also submitted that petitioner was married from before with one Ruhi, as would manifest from the FIR. It is thus submitted that the victim, who was a minor, was fooled by the petitioner knowing very well that being married from before he could not have performed his marriage with the victim, who admittedly is



a minor.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP and also taking into consideration the fact that petitioner being teacher of the victim committed such an occurrence, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

