

**In the Court of Addl. Sessions Judge II, Aurangabad**  
**A.B.P No. 392/26**  
**Mali PS case no. 158/25**  
**(Kriti Kumar v/s State of Bihar)**

**Counsel for the petitioner – Shree Babban Kumar Singh (Advocate).**  
**Counsel for the State – Shree Anil Kumar-II (A.P.P).**

---

**Present – Anindita Singh**  
**Addl. Sessions Judge II**  
**Aurangabad**

**24.3.26 -An application for anticipatory bail filed on behalf of accused petitioner Kriti Kumar who are apprehending his arrest in connection with Mali P.S. case no. 158/25 under section 96, 137(2), 3(5) BNS has been pressed today for hearing.**

**Heard Ld. Counsel of the petitioner as well as Ld. APP.**

**One Lalita Devi is the informant of the case who has filed a written report in Mali Police station alleging therein that on 6.8.25 at 10:00 AM her daughter Babita Kumari aged about 17 years has left her house for going college but she didn't return. On inquiry she got knowledge from people that Kriti Kumar (petitioner), Chhotu Ram, Pramila Devi, Manish Kumar, Purshottam Ram, Kapil Kumar have induced her daughter and have kidnapped her for the purpose of marriage. Accordingly FIR has registered.**

**It has been submitted on behalf of petitioner by his learned counsel that the petitioner is entirely innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR rather the entire case of prosecution is concocted one. The petitioner has not moved any bail petition either anticipatory or regular before the Hon'ble High Court or before any other Court earlier. As a matter of fact the father of the present petitioner and informant of the case are Jija Sali in relation and the father of present petitioner has given Rs. 1 lakh cash to the informant as loan and when he demanded to return said amount he has been falsely implicated by the informant in this concocted story. There is no independent witness in the present case and no reason has also been assigned for lodging the FIR too late. The other co-accused persons have been allowed bail by this court earlier vide ABP No. 2515/25. Moreover the matter has already been compromised between the parties outside the court. Accordingly, prayer has been made to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail.**

**On the other hand ld. APP has opposed the prayer of bail staunchly.**

**Heard and perused the case record, LCR as well as the case diary attached in ABP No. 2515/25 which has been called for from office and put up during the hearing of the bail petition. The present petitioner is named in the FIR and the thrust of allegation against him is of kidnapping minor daughter of informant for the purpose of marriage. The informant in her re-statement in para no. 3 and other witnesses in para no. 4, 8, 9 have supported the case. However, on perusal of para no. 16 of the case diary it appears that the victim suo motto appeared in the police station with her mother along with her mark-sheet of BSEB, Patna. The mark-sheet shows evidently that on the alleged date of occurrence she was complete major lady. In her statement given u/s 180 BNSS as well as given in 183 BNSS. She has made allegation of kidnapping against the present petitioner. Additionally she has alleged that she was forced to marry the petitioner and the petitioner also tried to do indecent acts with her and she was taken to Gujrat forcibly by petitioner.**

**Continued..**  
**24.3.2026**

***Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case and materials available on the case record, I do not consider it a good case for grant of privilege of pre-arrest bail. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of above named petitioner is hereby rejected.***

***Sd/-***  
***( Anindita Singh)***  
***Addl. Sessions Judge -II***

**CIVIL COURT AURANGABAD**