

In the Court of District and Addl. Sessions Judge I, Benipur, Darbhanga.

Present

**Rishi Gupta
I/c Dist.& Addl. Sessions Judge- I, Benipur**

Benipur, dated, the 30th March, 2026

Anticipatory Bail Petition no. 51 of 2026

Leeladhar Yadav

.....Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Bihar

.....Opposite Party

Counsel for the petitioner :- Mr. Azad Alam, Ld. Advocate.

Counsel for the State :- Smt. Punam Jha, Ld. APP.

30.03.2026

ORDER

The present anticipatory bail petition has been filed on behalf of petitioner namely Leeladhar Yadav S/o- Raj Kumar Yadav, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Alinagar PS case No. 32 of 2025, for the offences U/Ss 137(2), 140(3), 3(5) of BNS, which is pending in the Court of Ld. SDJM, Benipur, Darbhanga.

Heard Mr. Azad Alam the Ld. Counsel for the petitioner and Smt. Punam Jha, Ld. A. P.P. on behalf of the State.

The FIR in the present case has been lodged on the basis of written application of informant namely Varun Kumar Yadav. The case of the prosecution as stated in written application of informant in brief is that on 12.02.2025 at around 4 PM the son of informant namely Gautam Kumar Yadav aged about 12 years and his nephew Murari Kumar Yadav aged about 14 years went to see fair at Baleta Ghat. At 10 PM the informant has received a call from village Katma, PS- Manigachi that his son has been kidnapped by the petitioner and other as named in the FIR. On the basis of aforementioned information the police has registered Alinagar PS case No. 32 of 2025, for the offences U/Ss 137(2), 140(3), 3(5) of BNS against the petitioner and others.

The Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is quite innocent and he has committed no offence. The petitioner has falsely been implicated in this false case. No such occurrence did ever take place as alleged in the FIR. That from perusal of FIR it appears that the purpose of kidnapping has not been mentioned in the application

of informant. The petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents. The petitioner is a law abiding citizen and he is ready to abide by all the conditions as imposed by the court. Therefore the present petition may be allowed.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. P.P appearing on behalf of the State opposed the prayer for bail and submits that there is allegation upon petitioner that he has kidnapped the minor son and nephew of the informant. The offence is grave in nature. Therefore the present petition should be dismissed.

Heard the submissions made at bar and perused the case records of the present case. Para 3, 4 of the case diary mentions statement of witnesses who have supported the case. Para 24 and 25 of the case diary mentions statement of victim Murari Kumar Yadav and Gautam Kumar Yadav recorded u/s 183 of BNSS from perusal whereof it appears that both the victims have specifically stated about the participation of petitioner in their kidnapping. Considering the discussions made above, nature of allegation, active role played by the petitioner in the present crime, seriousness and gravity of the offence as well as other facts and circumstances of the case this court does not feel inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner namely Leeladhar Yadav S/o- Raj Kumar Yadav is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated and Corrected)

(Rishi Gupta)
I/c Addl. Sessions Judge I,
Benipur
30.03.2026.