

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10999 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2024 Thana- NARAINPUR District- Bhojpur

Janki Devi @ Jitan Wife of Pravin Dubey @ Pravin Kumar Dubey Resident
of Village - Karja Paharpur, P.S.- Bahoranpur, District - Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rima Devi Wife of Shashibhushan Pandey Resident of Village - Narayanpur,
P.S.- Narayanpur, District - Bhojpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Advocate.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 15-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The instant application for anticipatory bail has been filed by the petitioner apprehending her arrest in connection with Narayanpur P.S. Case No. 55 of 2024 instituted for the offence under Section 140(3) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that on 29.06.2024 at about 01:00 PM, the minor daughter of the informant got missing. She was searched by the informant, but she could not be found. During the course of the investigation, the victim was recovered from Narayanpur, District-Bhojpur, from a room, and in that room, one lady and two males were



there. They were Sheela Devi, Sonu Lal Kashyap and Rahul Kumar.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. She has falsely been implicated in this case. He also submits that during the course of the investigation, the victim has given her statement recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, wherein she has stated that the petitioner allured her by providing *Samosa*. After she consumed *Samosa*, she became unconscious. When she got conscious, she was at Dildar Nagar Railway Station. After this, her cousin aunt and one lady took her to a house in the jungle. At 02:00 PM, two persons arrived there. They called her to get ready in the evening. One other person arrived there having Rs. 2 lakhs and handed over the cash to her cousin aunt Sheela Devi. Sheela Devi handed over Rs. 60,000/- to the victim's cousin aunt. It is further stated that the victim was compelled to enter into prostitution. Moreover, a statement has been made in para-3 of this petition that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent.

5. In contra, learned APP appearing for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer of bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the



informant has stated that the petitioner is a lady who has forced the victim in prostitution and it is a case of human trafficking. She does not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and in the facts and circumstances of the case as stated above, this Court is not inclined to enlarge anticipatory bail to the petitioner, and as such, her application for bail is rejected.

7. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the learned trial court and prays for regular bail and the same shall be considered without being prejudiced by this order of rejection.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

