

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36990 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-491 Year-2025 Thana- AAJAM NAGAR District- Katihar

Naimuddin Son of Md. Manan @ Abdul Mannan Resident of Village-
Bangrora, P.S.- Pranpur, District- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Md Musowir, Adv Mr. Bimal Kumar, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Umeshanand Pandit

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Azamnagar PS Case No. 491 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 137(2) and 96 of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that on 25-12-2025 at about 11:30 AM, his daughter
aged about 15 years was studying in a Madarsa, it is next
alleged that Principal of the said Madarsa called the informant
on his mobile and informed that the victim is missing since
morning, accordingly the informant went to the Madarsa and



asked about the victim from the teachers but they did not give any information about the whereabouts of the victim, thus the informant doubted that teachers of the Madarsa had concealed the victim.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant being head *Molwi* of the Madarsa. It is next submitted that victim did not use to attend class properly and thus the petitioner had scolded her two days back when she fled from the Madarsa.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the victim was recovered and her statement was recorded under Section 183 BNSS wherein she supported the case of the prosecution and has stated that the petitioner had sold her to two persons as recorded in the order impugned. It is further submitted that victim is a minor aged about 15-16 years and the victim in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS has specifically alleged against the petitioner that it was he who sold her to two different persons on 25-12-2025 and the said persons kept her confined in a closed room and even used to threaten at the point of knife but the victim somehow managed to escape from their



clutches and boarded a train to Malda where she met a person who got her in contact with the police and accordingly she was recovered.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into submission the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

