

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16525 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-537 Year-2022 Thana- ATRI District- Gaya

-
1. Parmanand Manjhi @ Parmanand Kumar Son of Shiv Kumar Manjhi R/o Village - Panditpur Sohadi, P.S. - Atri, District - Gaya.
 2. Shiv Kumar Manjhi @ Shiv Kumar Late Nanhak Manjhi R/o Village - Panditpur Sohadi, P.S. - Atri, District - Gaya.
 3. Ganesh Manjhi Son of Dileep Manjhi R/o Village - Karpi, P.S. - Mahkar, District - Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Parmeshwar Vishwakarma
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Binod Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 07-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 366(A), 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that
the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that his minor daughter aged about 16 years
was living at his cousin sister's place where petitioners came
and enticed her on pretext of marriage and eloped with the
victim and accordingly, informant called father of Parmanand



Manjhi and disclosed about the occurrence when he abused and threatened him.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that victim and Parmanand were in love and the victim eloped with him. It is further submitted that in order to give seriousness to the case, it is alleged that victim was a minor when her date of birth as per her matriculation certificate is 03.04.2004 and the case was instituted in the Year 2022, by then the victim was 18 years of age. It is also submitted that victim has come back and her statement was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. wherein she has stated that she stayed with Parmanand at Hajipur for twenty days, but subsequently, Parmanand resiled from marrying her. It is thus submitted that this amply demonstrates that the relationship was consensual between two consenting adults. It is also submitted that no specific allegation is alleged against the petitioner nos.2 and 3. It is next submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioners will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove their innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail



application.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, are directed to be released on anticipatory bail on their furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Atri P. S. Case No.537 of 2022, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

