

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24482 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-915 Year-2025 Thana- MAJHAULIA District- West Champaran

Ranjan Kumar @ Rambabu Kumar S/o Umesh Mahto R/o vill- Bankat
Mushahari, Ward No 2, Ps- Majhauliya, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Rajesh Mishra S/o Late Pandit Mishra R/o vill - Ratanmala ward no. 1, P.S.-
Manjhauliya, Dist.- West Champaran, Motihari

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Adv.
For the Informant/ resp.	:	Mr. Akhileshwar Kumar Shrivastava, Adv.
	:	Ms. Amrit Kirit, Adv.
For the State	:	Ms. Asha Devi, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The accused/petitioner seeks bail in connection

with Majhauliya P.S. Case No.915 of 2025 registered for the

offences punishable under Sections 137(2), 87, 3(5) of the

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'B.N.S.').

3. The accused/petitioner is named in the FIR and

is in custody since 13.12.2025.

4. The allegation against the petitioner is to kidnap

minor daughter of informant aged about 16 years for the

purpose of illicit intercourse/ marriage with another person.



5. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that during course of investigations the statement of victim/ daughter of informant was recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS where she categorically stated that she left her parental home on her own for the home of her maternal uncle, namely, Rajendra Mishra, and this fact was not in the knowledge of her parents, therefore out of suspicion, the present false case was lodged against this petitioner. It is submitted that even the medical report suggest nothing incriminating as no penetrative sexual assault/ rape as alleged was committed upon the victim. While concluding argument, it is submitted that after the cognizance not even charge was framed in this case, and therefore there is all probability that the trial of this case is not likely to conclude within preferred timeline as available under Section 35(2) of the POCSO Act. Petitioner claimed clean antecedent.

6. Learned APP opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

7. Learned counsel, Mr. Akhileshwar Kumar Shrivastva, while appearing for informant and opposing



present bail submitted that the allegation is specific against this petitioner as per FIR, whereas he could not disputed the factual submission as made aforesaid *qua* statement of victim as recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS.

8. In view of aforesaid factual submissions and by taking note of fact as victim while recording her statement under Section 183 of BNSS, not even named this petitioner rather she stated that she, out of her own, left her parental home for her maternal uncle home denying all allegations *qua* kidnapping and sexual assault coupled with the fact that petitioner is in custody since 13.12.2025, where progress of trial suggest that same is not likely to conclude within preferred timeline of one year, as provisioned under Section 35(2) of the POCSO Act, accordingly, the petitioner, above-named, is directed to be released on bail furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned D.A.S.J. -VI cum Special Judge POCSO, West Champaran, in connection with Majhauriya P.S. Case No.915 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 437(3)



of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short 'CrPC')/under
Section 480(3) of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita
(for short 'BNSS')

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J.)

Aniket/-

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

