

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11437 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-211 Year-2025 Thana- SONBERSHA RAJ District- Saharsa

Indal Kumar Son of Binod Sah Resident of Village -Rakhauta Tola Chakla,
Ward no. 13, PS -Sonbarsa Raj District -Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Anil Ram Son of Late Kapileshwar Ram Resident of village- Khajuraha
Ram Tola Ward no. 07, PS- Sonbarsa Raj District -Saharsa

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Satish Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Binay Krishna, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Amarnath Jha, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 14-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State, learned counsel for the informant and perused
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Sonbarsa Raj P.S. Case No. 211 of 2025, instituted for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 137(2), 96,
352, 351(2), 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, read
with Sections 4/18 of POCSO Act and Section 3(1)(r)(s) SC/ST
Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner
allegedly kidnapped the informant's minor daughter from a
village fair, and she also took Rs. 55,000/- in cash from the



informant's house.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the victim was not kidnapped by the petitioner rather she left her house on her own will. It is next submitted that the victim has not supported the prosecution case in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and has stated that she was in love with the petitioner. It is further submitted that the victim has refused for her medical examination. The petitioner is in custody since 20.11.2025 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is further submitted that there is specific allegation of luring informant's minor daughter against the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.



7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of five months from the date of receipt/production, the petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

