

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90679 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-177 Year-2024 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Neeraj Kumar @ Neeraj Thakur @ Niraj Thakur S/o- Shri Bhagwan Thakur
R/O- Village- Harnahiyen, P.S- Purhania, District- Sheohar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Navin Kumar S/o- Late Ramsharnagat Singh R/v- Gaighat W.No-1, PS- Rumni Saidpur District- Sitamarhi

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Priyanka Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

3 19-03-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Runnisaidpur P.S. Case no.177 of 2024 registered under sections 363, 366A and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that his 13 year old daughter who had gone to give examination did not return and was not to be found inspite of search. Thereafter the informant received a phone call from the mobile number given in the FIR from the petitioner that his daughter has been kidnapped.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. No such occurrence as alleged has taken place. It is submitted that the informant states that his daughter had gone to appear in the examination with a mobile phone which is incorrect as no mobile phone was permitted in the examination centres. There is a delay in lodging of the FIR. The daughter of the informant returned and her statement was recorded under section 164 Cr.P.C. The petitioner is in custody since 16.9.2025 and has no criminal antecedent. Chargesheet has been submitted in the case.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the daughter of the informant returned and in her statement under section 164 Cr.P.C., her age has been assessed to be 14 years. She has supported the allegation of kidnapping against the petitioner. It is not disputed that there is no allegation of sexual offence against the victim.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegation against the petitioner in the FIR and the contents of the statement recorded under section 164 Cr.P.C. wherein the victim has supported the allegation of



kidnapping against the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

7. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after six months or on framing of charge, whichever is later.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/-

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

