

In the Court of District & Additional Sessions Judge-I, Darbhanga, Bihar.
ABP No.- 59 of 2026

Ref :- Arising out of Keoti PS Case No.- 300 of 2025, Dated- 27.11.2025, U/s- 96, 140(3) of the BNS

In the matter of :-

Rajan Kumar Yadav @ Rajan Yadav, Aged about 20 years S/o Shivram Yadav,
R/o Village- Lalganj, P.S.- Keoti, District- Darbhanga

Petitioner

Versus.

The State of Bihar

----- **Opposite Party**

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

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

Date of order:- 10.04.2026

ORDER

1. The petitioner above named seeks pre-arrest bail in connection with Keoti PS Case No.- 300 of 2025, Dated- 27.11.2025, U/s- 96, 140(3) of the BNS is pending in the court of Ld ACJM-IX, Darbhanga.
2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the minor daughter of the informant went missing on 26.11.2025 while proceeding to her school. Subsequently, it came to the knowledge of the informant that Savita Devi, Khushi Kumari, the present petitioner Rajan Yadav, and two unknown persons had allegedly kidnapped his daughter. It has further been alleged that the petitioner operates a gang engaged in illicit activities and that the victim was abducted with the intention of selling her or compelling her into immoral activities.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further contended that the petitioner has a clean antecedent and his name has surfaced merely on suspicion without any specific overt act attributed to him. It is also submitted that the victim has since been recovered and has made her statement before the court; hence, the petitioner deserves the privilege of anticipatory bail.
4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail. It is submitted that as per paragraph 42 of the case diary, the date of birth of the victim is 30.04.2008 and she was a minor

at the time of the alleged occurrence. It is further submitted, referring to paragraph 37 of the case diary, that the victim, in her statement, has specifically alleged that the present petitioner enticed her and persuaded her to leave her home. It is alleged that at the instance of the petitioner, the victim left her house and the petitioner took her to a train and thereafter handed her over to his associate, who took the victim to Hyderabad. In view of the gravity of the allegations and the involvement of the petitioner, it is prayed that the anticipatory bail application be rejected.

5. Having considered the submissions of the parties, the materials available on record, particularly the age of the victim and her statement recorded during investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Dictated)

**District & Addl Sessions Judge-I
Darbhanga.
10.04.2026**

Date of Order	10.04.2026
Date of Reserving Order	10.04.2026
Uploading Date	15.04.2026
Uploaded by	Pushkar (Stenographer)