

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32068 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-97 Year-2019 Thana- MOKAMAH District- Patna

1. Shobha Devi @ Runa Devi W/O Sanju Ram @ Sanjeev Ram @ Sanjeet Ram R/O Village- Ward No. 1(11), Mekra Dih (Melocahid), P.S.- Mokama, Dist.- Patna.
2. Sita Devi @ Manisha Kumari @ Manisha Kumar W/O Bablu Ram R/O Village- Ward No. 1(11), Mekra Dih (Melocahid), P.S.- Mokama, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. X W/O Y R/O Village- Mekara (Nao Ghar), P.O.- Mekara, P.S.- Mokama, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Lal Babu Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Narendra Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-05-2026 **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 363, 366A and 34 of the IPC and later on Section 376 (P.H) IPC and Section 4 of POCSO Act were added.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and are women and in sum and substance the allegation is that the minor daughter of the informant was kidnapped on 6-5-2019 at 6 pm



by the accused, it is next alleged that Rinku Devi used to tell her to marry her daughter as she had got a boy thus apprehends that the named accused persons in collusion kidnapped her minor daughter.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioners are not named in the FIR and their name transpired in the confessional statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 BNSS. It is further submitted that victim in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS has supported the case of the prosecution and has stated that she was raped by Raju. It is further submitted that petitioner no. 1 is mother of Raju and petitioner no. 2 is sister of Raju as such it does not appear probable that petitioners would have aided Raju in committing the occurrence, but since they are related with Raju hence they also came to be implicated in the instant case. It is also submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioners, the petitioners will not abscond rather will co-operate in the investigation to prove their innocence.

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 the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Mokamah P.S. Case No. 97 of 2019, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

