

In the Court of Additional Sessions Judge-VI-cum-Spl. Judge, POCSO, Madhepura  
A.B.P.- 318/2026

(Arising out of Singheshwar P.S. Case No. 153/2020)

1

Chintu Kumar, S/o- Chandra Mohan Yadav,  
R/o- village- Itahari, Ward no. 2, P.S. Singheshwar, District- Madhepura.

.... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Bihar ..... O.P.

04/04/26

An anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of above named petitioner, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Singheshwar P.S. Case No. 153/2020 u/s- 366A IPC, has been pressed today for hearing. Copy of petition already served to Id S.P.P. for state. Notice has been sent to the informant.

Heard Sri Rajesh Nandan, learned lawyer appearing on behalf of the petitioners and Id. S.P.P. for the state and perused the case record.

The prosecution story is that the informant Basant Kumar has lodged an FIR to this effect that on 14.06.2020 at night, after takin meal, her minor daughter went to sleep. At 11:30 pm informant wake up and found that her minor daughter was missing. At morning, he knew that Chintu Kumar (petitioner), Pintu Kumar and other co-accused persons kidnapped the minor daughter of the informant with intent to marriage. Thereafter, he lodged the FIR.

The Id. Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is quite innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that statement of victim recorded u/s 164 CrPC in which she did not supported the allegation of kidnapping. Victim stated that she went with petitioner voluntarily and married with him in her statement recorded u/s 164 CrPC. No case of u/s 366A IPC has been made out against the petitioner. Petitioner has got any criminal antecedent. It is further submitted that petitioner is ready to abide all the terms and conditions laid down against the petitioner.

The Id. S.P.P vehemently opposed the bail and prayed to reject the same.

Heard, both sides and perused the FIR and the available CD. Record reflects

04/4/26

04/04/26  
Contd...

that the FIR has been lodged for allegation of kidnapping of informant's daughter against the petitioner. Re-statement of informant (in para- 5), place of occurrence (in para- 3) and statement of witnesses (in para- 6, 39, 40) have supported the case of prosecution. The statement of victim u/s 164 CrPC has been recorded in which she stated that she eloped with Chintu Kumar (main accused) and married with him voluntarily. So, it appears that victim girl is quite apparent that petitioner was in continuous company of victim girl and has retained the minor girl of informant without permission of her legal guardian. Educational testimony reflects that the date of birth of victim is 08.03.2003 mentioned in her School Mark Sheet, appears minor at the time of occurrence. Cognizance has been taken against the petitioner by the Id. court. Considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, I do not find this is a fit case for Anticipatory bail. As such, I am not inclined to grant the accused petitioner namely, Chintu Kumar the privilege of anticipatory bail. Hence, the present Anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner stands, **rejected**.



Dictated

*Amit Kumar Pandey*  
04.4.26  
(Amit kumar Pandey)

Dist. & Addl Sessions Judge-VI  
-cum-Spl. Judge, POCSO,  
Madhepura