IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74801 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011049292026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-36 Year-2026 Thana- SANHAULA District- Bhagalpur

==========

Jito Kumar @ Jitendra Kumar Sah S/o Basuki Mahto R/o Village - Bhuwanchak, P.S - Sanhulla, District - Bhagalpur

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. XXXX S/o XXXX R/o Village - Bhuwanchak, P.S - Sanhulla, District - Bhagalpur

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajive Ranjan Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Choubey Jawahar, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 04-11-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 96 and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 24.03.2026 at 10:00 AM, her daughter left home on pretext of going to Sanhaula to appear in an exam, but did not return, accordingly a search was made, but the victim could not be located, during search, the informant came to know that petitioner had kidnapped his minor daughter in which he was

WEB COPY

assisted by his parents, further prior to the instant occurrence, the victim had earlier also fled from her house.

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 petitioner and the victim were in love and they eloped and they have performed their marriage. It is further submitted that statement of the victim was recorded under Section 183 BNSS wherein she has not supported the case of the prosecution. It is further submitted that though in the FIR, it is alleged that victim is a minor, but then she is a major, but then even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting then victim had reached the age of discretion where she was capable of understanding the consequences of her actions.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial

WEB COPY

court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Sanhaula P.S. Case No. 36 of 2026 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

U		T	

WEB COPY