

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.79777 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-315 Year-2025 Thana- RIGA District- Sitamarhi

=====

Kishan Kumar S/O Bhanta Paswan R/O Village- Bhavdepur, P.S- Riga, Distt.-
Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shanti Devi W/O Pragas Ram R/O Village- Bhavdepur, P.S- Riga, Dist.-
Sitamarhi.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Hans Lal Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-12-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2) and 96 of
B.N.S., 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that she saw petitioner and Shakti Suman Paswan
abducting her minor grand daughter aged about 15 years,
further, petitioner enticed her grand daughter and even took
Rs.36,000/- kept in the house.

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 from perusal of the allegations, as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that it is the case of elopement and not of kidnapping. It is also submitted that victim came back and her statement was recorded under Section 183 B.N.S.S. wherein she has not supported the case of the prosecution.

5. The learned APP and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant oppose the anticipatory bail application. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the victim is aged about 15 years and thus is a minor and the petitioner is aged about 28 years. It is also submitted that the victim is of a vulnerable age and she does not understand the consequences of her action but then petitioner is a major but still he committed the occurrence of enticing the victim to accompany him and the victim while accompanying the petitioner even took Rs.36,000/- from the house.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the informant, this Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected in connection with Riga P.S. Case No.315 of



2025, pending in the court of learned District & Additional
Sessions Judge-VI-cum-Special Judge (POCSO Act), Sitamarhi.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sanjay/-

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

