

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49411 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-226 Year-2024 Thana- RAUTA District- Purnia

=====

Aman Kumar S/O Naresh Sahni Village- Naya Tola, Mohanpur, P.S.-
Mufassil, Distt.- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Jenav Khatoon wife of Jamal Sah Resident of village- Routa Purani Hat,
Panchayat- Routa, Ward no.6, P.S.- Routa, Purnea

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bijendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

5 07-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with

Sessions Trial No. 29 of 2025 arising out of Routa P.S. Case No.

226 of 2024, registered for the offences under Sections 87 and

137(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. As per the prosecution case, the daughter of the

informant went to a shop near the house for purchasing some

goods however, she did not return and on search she could not

be located. It is further alleged that on 01.10.2024, she received

a call on which her daughter was heard weeping and she had

informed that one boy had taken her along with him but she did



not disclose his name.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated and this was a case of love affair. It is further submitted that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and subsequently during course of investigation when the girl was recovered the victim had taken his name however she had denied the factum of kidnapping and inducing her to compel her to marry him. It is next submitted that in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the B.N.S.S. she has stated that the petitioner had brought her for the purposes of marriage however she came to know that the petitioner is a married person and also had a son and hence felt cheated and thereafter she returned. Learned counsel for the petitioner next submitted that from the perusal of the statement of the victim, it would be evident that there was no bad intention of the petitioner and he carries clean antecedent and he is in custody since 04.10.2024.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the period of custody of the petitioner, he is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds in the sum of



Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge, Purnea in connection with Sessions Trial No. 29 of 2025 arising out of Rouda P.S. Case No. 226 of 2024, subject to the following conditions:

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

(ii) the petitioner will remain present on each and every date fixed by the Court below, if so required by the learned Trial Court;

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

(iv) the Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bonds of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of the same on in the name of verification.

(v) the petitioner is refrained from meeting with the victim or her family members and shall not try to influence



them.

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

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

krishna/-

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

