
In the Court of Sessions Judge, East Champaran at Motihari.

Present:-

Abhishek K. Das
Sessions Judge,
East Champaran at Motihari.

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 2919 of 2026

1. Ranjay Paswan, aged about 31 years, S/o- Shiv Paswan.
R/o- village- Matiyariya, P.S. Harsidhi, District-East Champaran.
-----**Petitioner.**

Versus

The State of Bihar. -----**Opposite party.**

Counsel for the Petitioner :- Sri Shailendra Kumar Jha, Advocate.
Counsel for the State :- Sri Khublal Prasad, Public Prosecutor.

24.06.2026

This anticipatory bail petition is filed on behalf of petitioner Ranjay Paswan, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 110 of 2018 u/s 366(A) and 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

As per para-2 of the anticipatory bail petition, earlier A.B.P. No. 3111/2019 of the petitioner was rejected on merit by the Court of learned A.S.J.-1, Motihari, except that no other anticipatory or regular bail petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner either in this Court or before any superior Court and as para-3 of the anticipatory bail petition, the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

As per F.I.R., the informant Rajdeo Das alleged that on 05.03.2018 he was busy in wedding procession of his nephew and was preparing to join the procession, meanwhile all the persons named in the F.I.R. including the petitioner got his 12 years old minor daughter Bachchi Kumari ready to attend the procession. Ranjay Kumar (petitioner) and another Pappu Kumar, in conspiracy with other co-accused persons, took his minor daughter to the wedding procession on a motorcycle bearing registration no. JH01G-2188. On 06.03.2018 when the procession returned and the informant's daughter was nowhere to be found, he questioned Pappu Kumar about the matter, but received no clear answer. Subsequently a *panchayati* was convened, but it yielded no result as the accused persons fled away from there. It is further alleged that all the persons named in the F.I.R. including the petitioner abducted the informant's daughter with the intention of killing her, marrying her or forcing her into wrongdoing.

24.06.2026
Continued

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is quite innocent and he has committed no offence. The alleged offences are also not being attracted against the petitioner. Both the parties have compromise the case.

The learned Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State has opposed the anticipatory bail.

Heard both sides and perused the record. From perusal of the record, it transpires that the petitioner is named in the F.I.R. with the allegation of kidnapping the informant's minor daughter with intention to killing her, marrying her or forcing her into wrongdoing. As per para-42 of the case diary, containing statement of victim recorded u/s 164 Cr.P.C., she has stated that the petitioner abducted her and taken away her in Mumbai. Record further reveled that the petitioner's first anticipatory bail petition had been rejected on merit by the Court of Ld. A.S.J.-1, Motihari in the year 2019. The petitioner has filed this second anticipatory bail petition citing the compromise, while the case is non-compoundable in nature. There is no valid change of circumstance. However, process u/s 82 Cr.P.C. has already been issued against the petitioner by the learned Trial Court vide order dated 27.02.2026. The petitioner is evading the process of law.

Thus, in the facts of the case and in terms of order of Hon'ble High Court, Patna vide order dated 11.09.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 59892 of 2024 (**Maya Sinha & Anr. vs. the State of Bihar & Anr.**) and a judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Prem Shankar Prasad vs. State of Bihar & Anr.** reported in **(2022) 14 SCC 516**, this anticipatory bail petition is not maintainable as the process u/s 82 Cr.P.C. has been issued against the petitioner, and accordingly, it is **dismissed**.

(Dictated)

Sd/-
Sessions Judge
East Champaran at Motihari
24.06.2026