

**In the Court of District & Addl. Sessions Judge-VI-cum-Spl.
Judge POCSO, Gopalganj.**

B.P. No. 210 of 2026

In the matter of :-

Halchal Dubey @ Arun Kumar Dubey, :-----Petitioner.

Versus.

The State of Bihar :-----Opposite Party.

Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner :- Sri Santosh Chaudhary, Adv.

Ld. Counsel for the State :- Sri Daroga Singh, Spl. P.P.

Date of order- 01st of April, 2026

Present :- Pankaj Chandra Verma.

1. Bail Application filed on behalf of above-mentioned accused petitioner, who is in custody since 23.02.2026 in connection with Bhore P.S. Case No.-316 of 2025, registered under Section 87 of B.N.S., is put up for hearing today.

2. Heard the parties and perused the record.

3. Ld. defence counsel submitted to the effect that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence and prosecution story is totally false, fabricated and petitioner bears clean criminal antecedent. Further submitted that petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence and has been remanded only due to confusion and misconception of facts. In the given circumstances, as further submitted, the petitioner may kindly be admitted to the privilege of bail.

4. Ld. P.P. for the State opposed the prayer of bail of petitioner.

5. As per FIR, prosecution case, in brief, a written application filed by the informant, Nuresha Khatoon stating therein that on 03.07.2025, Rajan Dubey and Harendra Dubey kidnapped minor daughter of informant. It is also alleged that his daughter took jewellerys and Rs. 40,000/- with her. Hence, the F.I.R.

6. Heard both the sides and perused the entire case record. The allegation against this petitioner is that he along with

**IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-VI-CUM-SPL.
JUDGE POCSO, GOPALGANJ.**

B.P. No. 210 of 2026

Present : Pankaj Chandra Verma,
Date of Order: 01.04.2026

others kidnapped minor girl of informant. Para Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7 contains re-statement of informant and statement of witnesses, in which they have supported the allegation made in F.I.R. This petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. and his name came into picture after recording of statement of victim. During course of investigation statement of victim u/s 180 and 183 of B.N.S.S. has been recorded, which are mentioned in Para 17 and 23 of case diary respectively, in which victim has stated that this petitioner along with other kidnapped her and tried to make forcible physical relation with her. Para 39 of case diary contain admit card of victim showing date of birth of victim is 18.03.2008 and date of occurrence is 03.07.2025, as such victim is child as required and defined under POCSO Act. The petitioner claims that the case is compromised and informant is present in the Court, who supports the factum of compromise. But, victim is not present, further compromise has no role to play in such a heinous crime against a minor. In this case investigation is pending against this petitioner and the offences are serious in nature and against a minor. Looking into gravity and seriousness of the offence this Court does not find case of this Petitioner fit for grant of bail.

7. Considering the said circumstances, do not find it fit to admit the petitioner/accused to the privilege of bail. Accordingly, bail prayer of petitioner/accused is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

**(Pankaj Chandra Verma)
District & Addl. Sessions Judge-VI
-cum-Spl. Judge POCSO,
Gopalganj.
01.04.2026**

Date of Judgment/Order	01/04/26
Date of Reserving Judgment/Order	N/A
Uploading Date	6/4/21
Uploaded by	G.G. (Stenographer)