

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67877 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-325 Year-2025 Thana- RAHUI District- Nalanda

=====

Aman Kumar @ Prince Kumar @ Prince, Son of Ranjeet Singh, Resident of
Village- Dekpura, P.S.- Rahui, District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raj Kishor Prasad, Adv.
Mr. Ashok Kumar @ Ashok Karn, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar No.3, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

- 3 15-11-2025 1. Heard Mr. Raj Kishor Prasad, learned senior
counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Binod Kumar No.3, learned
APP for the State.
2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Rahui P.S. Case No. 325 of 2025 dated 11.06.2025 registered for
the offences punishable under Sections 137(2), 140(3) and 3(5)
of the BNS.
3. As per the prosecution story, the informant
(Dimple Devi) reported that her 17 years old daughter, namely,
Riya Kumari went missing from their home during the night of
10.06.2025 and could not be traced out despite extensive search.
She suspected that Prince Kumar (petitioner), Prashant Kumar
and Raju Kumar, seen near her house earlier, had kidnapped her



daughter.

4. The main submissions advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner are that the allegations levelled against the petitioner in the FIR as well as in the statement recorded by the victim under Sections 180 and 183 of the BNSS are completely false, the occurrence is said to have taken place on 09.06.2025 but the FIR was registered only on 11.06.2025 which in itself casts a serious doubt in the credibility of the prosecution story.

5. On the other hand, Mr. Binod Kumar No.3, learned APP appearing for the State has vehemently opposed the bail prayer of the petitioner and submits that the victim has levelled serious allegations against this petitioner who is said to be the main accused and against him, there are three criminal antecedents.

6. Considering the seriousness of the allegation revealed by the victim as discussed in the trial court's order and coupled with the petitioner's three criminal antecedents, this Court is not inclined to grant the relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer stands rejected.

7. As the victim has been recovered, so, petitioner is given a liberty to surrender before the trial court, if he avails this



liberty in the next four weeks from today then the trial court will
decide his regular bail application on its own merits, without
being prejudiced by this order.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

Rajiv/-

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

