

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36876 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-73 Year-2025 Thana- BAHERA District- Darbhanga

Md Haider @ Haider Ali @ Md. Haider Nadaf S/o Md .Chhedi @ Chhedi Nadaf Resident of Village - Mahinam tole, Khabhna, P.S.- Bahera, District - Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Girish Chandra Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Akshay Lal 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 Bahera PS Case No. 73 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 96 and 3(5) 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 her minor daughter aged about 14 years went to buy grocery on 6-2-2025, but did not return, on search a shopkeeper disclosed that he saw Md. Haider Ali taking the victim on his motorcycle, accordingly the informant reached the house of Md. Haider Ali to enquire, when his family members abused.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that the petitioner and the informant were known to each other. It is further submitted that the victim has come back and her statement was recorded under Section 183 BNSS, wherein she has stated that petitioner had taken her to Mumbai where they stayed for 15 days but then it is submitted that victim does not allege that any physical atrocities were committed on her.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that the same records – *“this court perused the statement of the victim under Section 183 BNSS which shows that girl was a minor aged about 15 years and in her statement she has specifically stated that she was taken by Md. Haidar and she was kept in Mumbai”*, it is thus submitted that victim is a minor and even if she accompanied the petitioner willingly, her consent is immaterial.

6. Considering 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	
---	--	---	--

