

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72865 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-82 Year-2025 Thana- BHEJA District- Madhubani

Prakash Panjiyar @ Prakash Kumar Panjiyar Son of Late Sanjay Panjiyar
Resident Of Village- Khushiyahi Bhagwat P S- Marauna District -Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Baleshwar Kamat

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State, Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Bheja P.S. Case No. 82 of 2025, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 137(2), 96,
3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges
that her minor daughter aged about 15 years was seen accompanying
the petitioner on motorcycle by villagers, further her daughter while
leaving took Rs. 10,000/- along with jewellery.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner 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 victim has come back and her statement has been recorded under Section 183 BNSS, wherein she has not supported the case of the prosecution rather has stated that she had married the petitioner. It is further submitted that presently victim is staying with her parents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that victim is a minor aged about 15 years, it is next submitted that from pleadings made in the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that it does not even remotely suggest that victim is not a minor, it is further submitted that no doubt victim has not supported the case of the prosecution in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS, but then the marriage is voidable and since victim is a minor hence eloping with her is also an offence.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, 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	
---	--	---	--

