

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52164 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-59 Year-2026 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Saran

=====

Laxman Kumar @ Sagar @ Lakshman Kumar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Surendra Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GIRIJISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 29-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Saran Mahila P.S. Case No. 59 of 2026 instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 143, 144, 146, 316, 318 & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 16 of the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976.

3. As per the prosecution case, based on the written report of the Sub-Inspector-cum-SHO, Mahila P.S., is that on 02.05.2026 at about 09:00 A.M., acting on information received from the child helpline, she along with the police force and child helpline supervisor conducted a lawful search at M/s Mahavir Enterprises, Ramnagar. During the search, three minor girls were found. The girls disclosed that they had been lured through



social media/phone calls on the promise of money and brought for training after depositing ₹2,000 each, while an additional ₹28,000 was being demanded. They further stated that instead of training, they were made to sell clothes and other goods by the owner, Sikandar Prasad, and the petitioner, Lakshman Kumar, who worked as a guide, and they wished to return home. Alleging that the petitioner had lured the minor girls and engaged them in child labour, the present FIR was registered against the owner and the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner is not the owner of M/s Mahabir Enterprises, rather, he is merely an employee working as a computer operator on a monthly salary. The petitioner has no concern whatsoever with the alleged inducement of the victim girls who were brought to sell goods. In fact, it is the owner of the said firm who is responsible for bringing the victim girls. Furthermore, none of the victim girls has disclosed the name of the petitioner, rather, they stated that they had reached the place on their own, and there was no persuasion or inducement on the part of the petitioner. The petitioner has been in custody since 30.05.2026. Therefore, considering that the petitioner has a clean antecedent,



he deserves the privilege of being released on regular bail.

5. Learned APP appearing on behalf of the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner and submitted that the offences alleged against the petitioner, namely human trafficking and the forced labour of a minor girl, are serious in nature. Therefore, it has been contended that the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of being released on regular bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, and further taking into account that the petitioner is neither the owner of the firm nor has any ownership interest therein, but is merely employed as a computer operator at M/s Mahabir Enterprises, and that there is no specific role attributed to the petitioner in the allegations levelled against him in the F.I.R., as well as the fact that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Saran at Chapra in connection with Saran Mahila P.S. Case No. 59 of 2026, subject to the following conditions :-

(1) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be



properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(2) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witness, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(3) And, further condition that 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 antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Girijish Kumar, J)

amit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

