

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59198 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-44 Year-2025 Thana- MUSAHARI District- Muzaffarpur

Ladli Begum W/o Md. Amzad Resident of village - ward no. 26, Kathalbari,
P.S- Kishanganj, Distt.- Kishanganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amal Kumar Sinha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ashok Kumar Singh, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 11-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary called for in Cr. Misc.
No. 51259 of 2025.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Mushahari P.S. Case No. 44 of 2025 instituted for the offences
under Sections 137(2) and 87 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023.

3. As per prosecution case, the Informant's daughter
proceeded from her house to Haryana where her husband was
residing but, she did not reach there. It is further alleged that on
24.02.2025, she made call from mobile no. 9142943015 and
told that she was being kept at someone's house where she is
taking house work from her. Again on 10.03.2025, the victim



called from mobile no. 9279386701 and told that she was not being permitted to go out from the house. Hence, the F.I.R.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case merely on the basis of suspicion. He further submits that there is delay of one month in lodging the F.I.R. that too without there being any plausible explanation for the same which creates doubt in the veracity of the prosecution case. The petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. and her name has surfaced in this case in course of investigation. There is no specific or direct allegation of any overt act against the petitioner rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. The petitioner has not kidnapped the Informant's daughter. The victim girl in her statement recorded before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur has not named the petitioner of being involved in the alleged occurrence. The victim was not recovered from the house of the petitioner. There is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent in which she is on bail. The petitioner is lady and is languishing in judicial custody since 27.04.2025 without any rhymes or



reason.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged is serious in nature. From perusal of the statement of the victim girl recorded under Section 183 of the B.N.S.S., it appears that she was sold by her own husband and pushed into flesh trade. Again from perusal of Para 22 and 38 of the case diary, it appears that the victim girl was traced and recovered only on the basis of interrogation of the petitioner and, thus, the involvement of the petitioner cannot be ruled out in the alleged occurrence.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into account the nature and gravity of the offence as also considering the materials available in the case diary and the statement of the victim girl recorded under Section 183 of the B.N.S.S., this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of six months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of six months as stated



above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer
before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

