

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25290 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-89 Year-2025 Thana- SONEPUR District- Saran

Ranjan Kumar Yadav S/O Suresh Rai R/O Village- Sabalpur, Bangali Tola,
P.S.- Sonapur, Distt.- Saran at Chapra.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Uday Mahto S/O Brahmdeo Mahto R/O Village- Sabalpur Bangali Tola,
Raipur, Hasanpur, Gangapar, P.S- Sonapur, Distt.- Saran at Chapra.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mukesh Kumar Suman, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Binod Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 22-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sonpur P.S. Case No. 89 of 2025 registered on 04-02-2025 for the offence punishable under Sections 96 and 34 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case as emerges from the FIR is that on 01.02.2025, while sister of the informant was returning home after purchasing household items from Patna, it is alleged that petitioner and co-accused, Dhuri Kumar along with some other accused persons abducted her. The informant apprehends that the accused might have committed murder of his sister or subjected her to human trafficking. Accordingly, the FIR.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in this case on the basis of suspicion only. Learned counsel further submits that the victim, in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the B.N.S.S., has categorically stated that she had been in love with the co-accused, Dhuri Kumar @ Dhruv Kumar for the past four years. According to her statement. she left her home out of her own free will and went to Danapur Temple with a villager named Pappu, where she met Ranjan Kumar (petitioner) and his female friend. From there, she reached Danapur Junction and then boarded a train to Gujarat. After reaching Gujarat, she met with the co-accused, Dhuri Kumar @ Dhruv Kumar and stayed with him in a rented room for three days. Thereafter, her brothers went there and harassed them. Then both of them went to Surat and then to Ara, where they married in a temple. It is submitted that as per the victim's statement, there is no allegation against the petitioner and she voluntarily went with the the co-accused, Dhuri Kumar @ Dhruv Kumar. After attaining the age of 18, she was released from care home and went to the house of her in-laws, Lastly, it is submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and the co-accused, namely, Dhruv Baitha @ Dhuri Kumar with



whom she/victim has been stated to enter into the marriage, has been granted regular bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 04.02.2026 *vide* Cr. Misc. no. 6895 of 2026.

5. Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that the co-accused has been granted regular bail not the anticipatory bail.

6. Regard being had to the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the statement of the victim made under Section 183 of the BNSS and the main co-accused has been granted bail by the co-ordinate Bench, this Court is inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Let the petitioner be released on bail upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saran (Chapra), in connection with Sonpur P. S. Case No. 89 of 2025 subject to the as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS as well as the following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document to show his/her bona fide;



(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of his/their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

perwez

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

