

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6895 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-89 Year-2025 Thana- SONEPUR District- Saran

=====

Dhruv Baitha @ Dhuri Kumar S/O Suraj Baitha R/O Village- Sabalpur
Gulmahiyachak, P.S.- Naddi, District- Patna. wrongly mentioned in FIR as
Dhuri Baitha son of Suresh Baitha, resident of village- Sabalpur Bangali Tola,
P.S.- Sonpur, District- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajesh Kumar Jha, Advocate

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

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KHATIM REZA

ORAL ORDER

2 04-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sonpur
P. S. Case No. 89 of 2025, dated 04-02-2025 instituted for the
offence punishable under Sections 96 and 34 of the *Bhartiya*
Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that on
01.02.2025, while the sister of the informant was returning
home after purchasing household items from Patna, it is alleged
that petitioner and co-accused Ranjan Kumar Yadav along with
some others, abducted her. The informant apprehends that the
accused might have caused the death of his sister or subjected
her to trafficking.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that after the recovery of the victim, her statement was recorded under Section 183 of the B.N.S.S., wherein, she categorically stated that she had been in love with the petitioner for the past four years. She further stated that both her parents had died and her brother and sister-in-law did not treat her properly, often threatening her. According to her statement, she left home of her own will and went to Danapur Temple with a villager named Pappu, where she met Ranjan Kumar and his female friend. From there, she reached Danapur Junction and then boarded a train to Gujarat. After reaching Gujarat, she met the petitioner and stayed with him in a rented room for three days. Thereafter, her brothers went there and harassed them. Then both of them went to Surat and then to Ara, where they married at a temple. It is submitted that as per the victim's statement, there is no allegation against the petitioner and she voluntarily went with the petitioner. After attaining the age of 18, she was released from care home and went to the house of her in-laws. Lastly, it is submitted that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 25.04.2025 and has no criminal antecedents. Charge-sheet has already been



submitted in this case.

5. Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, let the petitioner be released on bail upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional District & Sessions Judge-15, Saran (Chapra), in connection with Sonpur P. S. Case No. 89 of 2025.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Khatim Reza, J)

shyambihari/-

U			
---	--	--	--

