

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76595 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-651 Year-2025 Thana- AHYAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

Satya Naraian @ Satya Narayan Sahani @ Satyanarayan Kumar S/O
Lakhindra Sahani R/O Village - Bhikhanpur, P.S. - Ahiyapur, Distt.-
Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Hari Kishore Thakur, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 09-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2), 87,
74, 126(2), 115(2), 352 and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. The Station House Officer and the Investigating
Officer of the case, in compliance of the order dated 02.12.2025,
are present in the Court.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean
antecedent and the informant alleges that petitioner used to tease
his daughter on way to coaching and forced her to have
relationship with him. Further, despite petitioner getting married
about three months back was still after his daughter. It is next



alleged that on 10.05.2024 his daughter had gone to coaching but did not return, thus, alleges that his daughter was abducted.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that petitioner and the victim were studying in a coaching where they came to know each other and fell in love but then their marriage was being opposed as they belonged to two different religions, since the parents of the petitioner and the victim made it clear to them that their marriage cannot be solemnized, as such, they had no option but to part. It is next submitted that petitioner got married about three months back and thereafter the instant case came to be instituted alleging that petitioner abducted the victim. It is also submitted that the victim came back and her statement was recorded under Section 180 BNSS wherein she disclosed that her parents intended to get her married but then she wanted to study, as such, she on her own left the house and went to the railway station and from there she came to Delhi, further no one kidnapped her but when her statement was recorded under Section 183 BNSS, she took a U-turn under parental pressure and stated that petitioner on 10.05.2025 came to her house when she was alone and on point of pistol kidnapped her and took her



to Delhi where they went to a hotel but then the hotel refused to give them accommodation, as such, they went to a house of a person where she stayed for eight days and the petitioner used to keep her confined in a room and even established physical relation thrice and thereafter the petitioner brought her to Muzaffarpur. She also states that she intends to stay with the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner, thus, submits that the statement of the victim recorded under Sections 180 and 183 BNSS is diatomic, rather is opposite. It is further submitted that though the victim in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS states that she along with the petitioner stayed at a house of a person for eight days but then does not disclose the name of the person where she stayed nor has given the name of the locality where the house was situated which amply demonstrates that the entire allegation of kidnapping is false and fabricated. More so, for the reason that the informant alleges in the FIR that on 10.05.2025 the victim had gone to the coaching but did not return while the victim in her statement recorded under Section 180 BNSS states that she on her own volition left the house and went to Delhi and thereafter in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS states that petitioner came to



her house when she was alone and forcibly took her to Delhi on point of pistol, as such, either the informant with false allegation instituted the FIR or the victim under parental pressure has got her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS. It is submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

7. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

8. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Ahiyapur P.S. Case No. 651 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

9. The personal appearance of the Station House Officer and the Investigating Officer of the case is dispensed with.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

