

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10410 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-454 Year-2025 Thana- RAJGIR District- Nalanda

=====

Renu Devi Wife of Late Binod Das Resident of Vill.- Chittabadi, P.S.-
Muffasil, District - Katihar, State - Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gaurav Kumar Verma

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 10-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Rajgir P.S. Case No. 454 of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 137(2), 142, 98, 99 of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that the minor daughter of the informant had gone out of the house to ease herself, and as she did not return for a considerable time, she was being searched.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during the course of the investigation, the victim was recovered, and she has given her statement recorded under Sections 180 & 183 of the BNSS. In her statement under Section 183 of the



BNSS, the victim has stated that she was having an affair outside marriage with one Rahul Kumar. He forcefully took her to the *baandh*. One Dharmendra Kumar was called there. Dharmendra Kumar brought a four-wheeler, and both Rahul Kumar and Dharmendra have forcefully boarded her in that four-wheeler. After that Rahul Kumar left the four-wheeler. Dharmendra Kumar took her to Rajgir railway station, and he parked his vehicle at Rajgir railway station and took her in a train, and there she met one lady who kept her in a room for twenty days and then handed her over to Md. Babar, and from Md. Babar she was handed over to Chhotu. He further submits that the petitioner is a lady. The investigation in this case has been completed. Moreover, statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner has no criminal antecedent and she is languishing in judicial custody since 22.09.2025.

5.The application for bail is vehemently opposed by the learned counsel for the informant and the learned APP for the State. Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that from perusal of the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, it is clear that this petitioner is a member of a racket that indulges in human trafficking, and first of all, the victim was kept with this petitioner, who has handed



her over to Md. Babar, and Md. Babar has handed her over to one Chhotu. He also submits that the petitioner, who is involved in the said occurrence, and her complicity is quite clear. He further submits that the bail petitions of similarly situated co-accused persons namely, Rahul Kumar and Md. Babar have already been rejected by this court vide Cr. Misc. Nos. 1230 of 2026 and 89054 of 2025 respectively.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage, however she may renew his prayer for bail after six months if the trial is not concluded. Learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

