

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76040 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-160 Year-2025 Thana- NAUHATTA District- Rohtas

Manjit Kumar Thakur Son of Raju Thakur Resident of Village- Bishunpur,
Police Station- Nauhatta, District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Usha Devi W/o- Ram Pravesh Chandel, R/o- Bishunpur, P.S.- Nauhatta,
District- Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rakesh Kumar Mishra

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Priya Sharan Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 10-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 137(2) and 96 of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits
that from perusal of the office report dated 19.03.2026, it
would manifest that registered cover notice has been
received by opposite party no.2.

4. Since registered cover notice has been received
by opposite party no.2, hence the notice is deemed to be
validly served. It is next submitted that opposite party no.2,



despite receiving notice, chooses not to appear and contest. It is also submitted that even case diary was called for but the same also till date has not been received.

5. It is further submitted that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that allegation is of enticing the minor daughter of the informant by the petitioner and his brother Rajesh. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the victim while fleeing from the house took away golden chain, earring and Rs.20,000/- which amply demonstrates that the victim on her own volition left the house. It is also submitted that victim came back and her statement was recorded under Section 180 BNSS wherein she has not supported the case of the prosecution, nor alleged anything against the petitioner, but when her statement was again recorded under Section 180 BNSS, the victim supported the case of the prosecution. Similarly the victim in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS has not supported the case of the prosecution, but subsequently, one statement was again recorded under



Section 183 of the BNSS, she supported the case of the prosecution. It is next submitted that from the narration of facts as recorded herein above, it would manifest that when statement of the victim was recorded under parental pressure, she supported the prosecution case and when the statement was recorded without any coercion she did not support the case of the prosecution. It is further submitted that even allegations in the FIR points to the fact that the victim had eloped with the petitioner or else she would not have taken golden chain, earring and cash while eloping. It is further submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

6. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application.

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



learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Nauhatta P. S. Case No.160 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

8. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

