

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9775 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-936 Year-2025 Thana- AHİYAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

Govind Kumar Son of Pawan Sah Resident of Village- Singhaula, P.S.-
Motipur, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Alok Kumar Alok

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Uday Pratap Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 27-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Ahiyapur P. S. Case No.936 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 137(2) and 87 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that petitioner came to his house on
06.07.2025 and requested him to allow to sleep in the house.
The petitioner was allowed to sleep in the house as he was
neighbour of informant's brother, but in the night he fled with
informant's daughter leaving his motorcycle.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the



informant. It is next submitted that victim is a married lady. It is also submitted that they were known to each other and it was at the call of the victim that the petitioner stayed back in the house in the night and thereafter victim on her own volition eloped.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that informant specifically alleges that on 06.07.2025, the petitioner came to his house and requested him to allow him to sleep in the house, since petitioner was neighbour of the brother of the informant, hence the informant trusting the petitioner allowed to sleep in his house, but then he committed the said act of abducting the daughter of the informant. The learned A.P.P. further submits that the case was taken up on 30.03.2026 and the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 BNSS was called for. The learned A.P.P. further after perusing the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 BNSS submits that victim has supported the case of the prosecution and has stated that petitioner about two months back had come to her house in the night and had committed wrong and thereafter he again came back and took her out of the house and left her at the station where his sister came and picked up her. The learned A.P.P. thus submits that victim is not supporting the petitioner in any



manner and the investigation of the case is continuing.

6. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that from perusal of the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 BNSS, it would manifest that the victim though has supported the case of the prosecution but then has not stated about the present occurrence rather has stated that about two months back the petitioner committed wrong on which the learned A.P.P. submits that specific allegation is alleged in the FIR that on 06.07.2025, the petitioner came to his house and requested him to allow him to sleep and later he abducted his daughter leaving behind his motorcycle which amply demonstrates that the presence of the petitioner in the house of the informant.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

