

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35103 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-496 Year-2025 Thana- KHUSRUPUR District- Patna

1. Arjun Yadav @ Arjun Roy S/o Baljeet Yadav Resident of Village- Sukarvegchak, PS- Khushrupur, Distt.- Patna
2. Sudhir Yadav @ Sudhir Kumar S/o Arjun Yadav @ Arjun Roy Resident of Village- Sukarvegchak, PS- Khushrupur, Distt.- Patna
3. Raju Yadav @ Raju Kumar S/o Arjun Yadav @ Arjun Roy Resident of Village- Sukarvegchak, PS- Khushrupur, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chandra Shekhar Sharma, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEEN KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 21-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in a case in connection with Khushrupur P.S. Case No. 496 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section 137(2), 126(2), 115(2), 3(5), 140(3) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. As per the prosecution case, the daughter of the informant who happens to be the victim of the case was found missing from the house. It is alleged that when he asked his wife about the whereabouts of her victim daughter she told that she had gone for answering the call of nature but she did not return



for considerable long time. It has further been alleged that co-accused Raunak Kumar and two unknown boys kidnapped his daughter. It is further alleged that when the informant went to the house of co-accused Raunak Kumar, he was also found missing, while the petitioners assaulted him. It has further been alleged that in the meanwhile petitioner no.1 who brought a country made pistol and threatened the informant to go away from the place, otherwise he will be killed and when he called on the mobile phone of co-accused Raunak Kumar, it was found switched off.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that they have been falsely implicated in this case. Referring to the impugned order, learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted that in the statement of the victim recorded under section 183 of the B.N.S.S, she has stated that she has herself married co-accused Raunak Kumar, who himself was a minor and referring to section 183 of the B.N.S.S., learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the victim has stated that petitioners were not involved in the case. It has further been submitted that the petitioners are family members of co-accused Raunak Kumar and they would not help co-accused Raunak Kumar in such acts. It has lastly been submitted that petitioners



have got no criminal antecedent.

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

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, let the above named petitioners, in the event of their arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be enlarged on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court concerned, in connection with Khushrupur P.S. Case No. 496 of 2025, subject to conditions as laid down under section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Praveen Kumar, J)

niku/rajesh/-

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

