

In the Court of District & Additional Sessions Judge-I, Darbhanga, Bihar.
BP No.- 104 of 2026

Ref :- Arising out of Keoti PS Case No.- 326 of 2025, Dated- 25.12.2025, U/s- 137(2), 96, 351(2), 3(5) of the BNS

In the matter of :-

Chandeshwar Yadav, Aged about 70 years, S/o Late Ram Sevak Yadav, R/o Village- Dherichak, P.S.- Keoti, District- Darbhanga

----- **Petitioner**

Versus.

The State of Bihar

----- **Opposite Party**

Learned counsel for the petitioner : Sri Amit Kumar, Advocate.

Learned counsel for Opp.Party : Sri Amrendra Narayan Jha, P.P.

Date of order:- 10.03.2026

ORDER

1. The petitioner is praying for regular bail in connection with Keoti PS Case No.- 326 of 2025, Dated- 25.12.2025, U/s- 137(2), 96, 351(2), 3(5) of the BNS is pending in the court of Ld ACJM-IX, Darbhanga. The petitioner is in judicial custody since 03.01.2026.
2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 23.12.2025, the minor daughter of the informant went from her house to attend school but did not return home. The informant then started searching for her and found her school bag lying on her bench in the school, but the girl was missing. Subsequently, the informant came to know that Nitish Kumar Yadav, Lalit Kumar Yadav, Chandeshwar Yadav and his wife had allegedly kidnapped his minor daughter. Thereafter, the informant went to the house of the accused persons where he was allegedly threatened by them. The informant further alleged that he has firm belief that his daughter has been kidnapped for the purpose of marriage and religious conversion.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedents. The petitioner is stated to be an old man aged about 70 years, suffering from cancer and several other ailments, and copies of certain medical prescriptions and reports have been filed in support of the said contention. It is also argued that the petitioner has been implicated only because he is the father of the main accused.
4. Learned Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State opposes the

prayer for bail and submits that the minor victim has not yet been recovered by the police.

5. On perusal of the medical papers produced on behalf of the petitioner, it appears that the age of the petitioner is mentioned as about 55 years and not 70 years as claimed in the bail petition. The documents further show that the petitioner is mainly suffering from anal fissure. It also appears from the record that the minor victim in the present case has not been recovered by the police so far.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that the minor victim is still missing, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the bail petition stands **rejected**.
7. However, the petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after recovery of the victim before the learned court concerned, which shall pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

(Dictated)

**District & Addl Sessions Judge-I
Darbhanga.
10.03.2026**

Date of Order	10-03-2026
Date of Reserving Order	
Uploading Date	13-03-2026
Uploaded by	Ratnesh Kumar (DEO)