

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2901 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-444 Year-2023 Thana- KARJA District- Muzaffarpur

Rajan Kumar @ Ranjan Kumar S/o Lakhindra Sah R/o Vill- Raksa Purvi
Tola, P.S.- Panapur, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Pushpa Sinha,APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 20-02-2026 Heard Mr. Manoj Kumar, learned counsel for the
petitioner and the learned APP for the State.

2. This application for grant of anticipatory bail arises out of Karja Police Station Case No. 444 of 2023 dated 23.12.2023, disclosing the offence under Sections 406, 420, 341, 365, 504, 506/34 of the IPC lodged by the informant, Sita Devi.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant alleged that she and her son, namely, Ranjit Kumar used to work in the Kurkure Factory located in Raksa and sometimes, she used to go to the factory vehicle to load and unload the factory goods. Her son Ranjit Kumar's salary of two months was pending. On demanding the same, the factory owner used to postpone the salary by adopting dilly-dallying tactics. On 03.12.2023, till evening her son did not return to home, so, on 4.12.2023, in the



morning, she went to the factory in search of her son. When the factory owners 1. Ranjan Kumar (petitioner herein), 2. Tipu Kumar, 3. Rajesh Kumar were inquired regarding whereabouts of her son, then all of them pretended to know nothing rather abused and pushed her away. Accordingly, the present FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and he has falsely been implicated in this case only on the basis of apprehension which would be evident from the narration of the FIR itself. He further submits by referring to the statements recorded by the victim, Ranjit Kumar on his return from Tamil Nadu and the FIR which is said to have been lodged by his mother/informant, there is discrepancy on the dates which according to the informant's statement, her son was missing since 03.12.2023 while as per the statement recorded by the victim, he was at his home till 04.12.2023, from-where the petitioner is said to have taken the victim to Tamil Nadu. Petitioner has got clean antecedent as stated in the paragraph-4 of the present petition.

5. On the other hand, learned APP opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner but concedes that the victim boy has returned to his home.



6. Considering the fact that the FIR has been lodged only on the basis of apprehension, the victim has returned to his home and the petitioner has got clean antecedent, this Court is inclined to grant the petitioners the privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. This application for anticipatory bail is, accordingly, allowed.

8. Let the petitioner, named above, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the Court below within six weeks from today, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, West Muzaffarpur in connection with aforesaid Police Station Case subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the B.N.S.S. 2023, as well as the following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his bail bond by the



Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of his/her bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

perwez

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

