

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80374 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-340 Year-2025 Thana- NAUTAN District- West Champaran

Ranjit Patel S/o Fulchand @ Gulchand Patel Resident of Village- Shivrajpur,
Ward No. 11, P.S.- Nautan, Dist.- West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. XXXX S/o Madin Miyan Resident of Village- Sheikh Toli, P.S.- Nautan,
Dist.- West Champaran

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajiv Nayan, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Rahul Kumar Shukla, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

5 13-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State, learned counsel for the informant and perused
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Nautan P.S. Case No. 340 of 2025, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2), 87, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner kidnapped informant's minor daughter with an intention to marry her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the



present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that there was love affair in between the petitioner and the victim. It is next submitted that she went with the petitioner on her own will and solemnized marriage with him in Nepal. It is further submitted that the medical report of the victim does not support the prosecution case. The petitioner is in custody since 14.07.2025 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is also submitted that the victim is a minor girl and there is specific allegation against the petitioner of enticing away the victim for the purpose of marriage. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

