

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33546 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-360 Year-2025 Thana- SUPAUL District- Supaul

=====

Anant Sada S/O Late Rami Sada R/O Mohalla- Mahua Mushari, Ward no. 12,
P.S. and Dist.- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Patna
2. XXX S/O Late Kailu Sada R/O Mohalla- Mahua Mushari, Ward no. 12, P.s.
and Dist.- Supaul

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kuldeep Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Jitendra Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satyendra Prasad, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 19-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State through Virtual Mode.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Supaul P.S. Case No. 360 of 2025 dated 10.07.2025
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 137(2), 96, 352 and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has
alleged that his daughter, aged about 14 years, was forcibly
taken away by his neighbours, namely Amit Kumar and Sanjit
Kumar. It is further alleged that when the informant tried to talk
to their father on the next day, he also abused him and attempted
to assault him.



4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated merely because he happens to be the father of the said Amit Kumar and Sanjit Kumar. It has further been submitted that the petitioner has no role to play in the fleeing of the minor daughter of the informant along with the said boys and such fact has been corroborated by the fact that the girl, when she was recovered, in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the B.N.S.S., has not stated anything about the role of the petitioner. It has further been submitted that in fact, the victim in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the B.N.S.S., has categorically stated that she was in love with the son of the petitioner namely, Amit Kumar and that she had voluntarily fled away with him. Lastly, it has been submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions made by the parties and taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner, above named, is directed to be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand)



with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Supaul P.S. Case No. 360 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure read with corresponding Section 482(2) of BNSS as well as subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors will be a close relative of the petitioner.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present before the concerned Court on each and every date of the trial and shall cooperate in the investigation.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.

(iv) The trial court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case, at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents, the trial court shall take necessary steps for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bond in terms of the above mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.



7. It is made clear that the observations, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

8. The application stands allowed.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Gautam/-

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

