

In the Court of Dipankar Pandey, Principal District & Sessions Judge, Bhagalpur, A.B.A. No. 733/2026, Dular Das & others Vs. The State of Bihar, order dated 05-05-2026.

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, BHAGALPUR

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 733/2026

Madhusudanpur P.S. Case No. 58/2026

Dular Das & others Versus State of Bihar

Counsel for the petitioners :- Sri Ajay Kumar Sinha, Advocate.

For the State :- Sri S.N.P. Sah, Public Prosecutor.

Date of Order	Order with Signature of the Court
1	2
05-05-2026	1. This anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of accused-petitioners, namely 1. Dular Das, 2. Usha Devi, 3. Guddu Das and 4. Khushboo Kumari, under Section 482 of B.N.S. Sanhita 2023, seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with Madhusudanpur P.S. Case No. 58/2026, instituted for the offences u/s 96, 3(5) of BNS. 2. Heard Sri Ajay Kumar Sinha, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri S.N.P. Sah, learned Public Prosecutor for the State. 3. The prosecution case as stated in the First Information Report is that on 12-03-2026 at about 9.30 A.M. the informant's daughter Anupam Kumari, aged about 17 years went to attend Computer Class at Noorpur, situated at Block road under Madhusudanpur P.S. but when she did not return till late night then the informant started searching her and in course whereof the informant, Dhaniya Devi learnt that the accused persons named in the F.I.R. including the petitioners abducted the informant's daughter with intention to marry her. It is further alleged that in course of search the informant learnt that her son-in-law Rohit Kumar with intention to marry abducted her daughter with the help of other accused persons. Thereafter, the informant went at the house of accused persons where the accused persons threatened the informant and ousted her. On the basis of written application of informant, the present case has been instituted. 4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence. They have falsely been implicated in this case. Entire allegation against the petitioners is false and concocted. He further submits that the informant is not an eye witness of the occurrence and no specific overt act has been assigned against the petitioners rather the allegation is general and omnibus. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are family members of co-accused Rohit Kumar and that's why they have been implicated in this case falsely, only with a view to harass them. The petitioners bears clean

Contd.
05-05-2026

antecedent. Out of four petitioners, two petitioners are women.

5. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and submitted that the petitioners are named in the F.I.R. with specific allegation that they along with co-accused Rohit Kumar abducted the minor daughter of informant with intention to marry her. During investigation the witnesses have supported the prosecution case. Further, the victim is still traceless. The investigation of the case is still going on.
6. Perused the case record as well as case diary. In course of investigation the I.O. has recorded the restatement of informant at para 2 of the case diary whereas at para 6 and 7 of the case diary statements of other witnesses has been mentioned and from perusal whereof it transpires that the witnesses have supported the prosecution case. The victim is still trace-less and the investigation of the case is still going on.
7. After having gone through the documents & the materials available on record, this court finds that the accused-petitioners are named in the F.I.R. with specific allegation that on the alleged date of occurrence they along with other co-accused abducted the minor daughter of informant with intention to marry her. The victim is still trace-less and the investigation of the case is still going on.
8. Therefore, considering the aforesaid facts as also the fact that the victim is still trace-less and the investigation of the case is at nascent stage and an iota of further material will come after recovery of the victim, the court is of the view that at this stage it is not fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of above named four petitioners stands **Rejected**.

Sd/-

(Dipankar Pandey)
Principal Sessions Judge.

Date of Judgment/Order	05-05-2026
Date of Reserving Judgment/Order	N/A
Uploading Date	06-05-2026
Uploaded by	R.B.D. Tripathi, Steno