

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 12609 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-63 Year-2025 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Vaishali

-
1. Lalita Devi W/o Dilip Thakur Resident of Village- Chakmahadin, PS- Jandaha, District- Vaishali
 2. Dilip Thakur S/o Late Basudeo Thakur Resident of Village- Chakmahadin, PS- Jandaha, District- Vaishali
 3. Runit Thakur S/o Dilip Thakur @ Mukesh kumar Resident of Village- Chakmahadin, PS- Jandaha, District- Vaishali
 4. Rinku Devi W/o Pankaj Thakur R/o vill - Nauachak, P.S.- Sarairanjan, Distt.- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. X D/o Y R/o vill - Chakmahadin, P.S.- Jandaha, Distt.- Vaishali

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar Jha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uma Shankar Prasad Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 23-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 64, 69, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 read with Section 9 Prohibition of Child Marriage Act and Section 4 of POCSO Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and petitioner no.1 and 4 are women and the informant alleges that while she was a minor, accused Rajnish forcefully married her on 18.02.2023 in a Shiva temple, thereafter started establishing physical relation,



further while she was in Intermediate in 2025, when Mukesh, Lalita and Arti pressurized her to leave her parental house and even gave Rs.10,000/-, thus she left her house without informing her parents and Rajnish took her to Delhi and kept her at his cousin sister Rinku Devi's place, thereafter started living separately like husband and wife, it is next alleged that Rajnish used to call unknown persons and made them see her, on protest, after one month Runit and Dilip brought her to Patna where Lalita and Arti received her at Danapur and brought her to Chakmahdin, where Runit forcibly tried to establish physical relation but on protest she was assaulted and ousted, thus came to the village, further the informant intends to stay with Rajnish.

4. Learned counsel submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant being mother, father, brother and cousin married sister of Rajnish. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant though alleges that Rajnish married her in the year 2023 when she was a minor but then no case came to be instituted, thereafter in 2025 they fled to Delhi, where again dispute arose, as recorded hereinabove and thereafter she came to Danapur and alleges that Runit, who



is brother of Rajnish intended to establish physical relation but on protest she was assaulted and ousted from the house. It is submitted that Rumit has been falsely implicated in the instant case only to coerce Rajnish into submission. It is next submitted that it is not the case that Rumit is alleged to have committed physical assault. It is next submitted that as far as other petitioners are concerned, they being relatives of Rajnish, have been implicated with general and omnibus allegation.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No.63 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

