

**In the Court of Dushyant Kumar**  
**District & Additional Sessions Judge-I**  
**Rosera , District-Samastipur**  
**A.B.P. No. 451-C of 2025**  
**C.I.S.No. 451-Cof 2025**  
**(Arising out of Singhiya P.S. Case No. 79 of 2025)**  
**Date: 19.05.2026**

**Santosh Paswan @ Santosh Kumar**

**.....Accused/Petitioner**

**vs.**

**State of Bihar.**

**.....Prosecution/O.P.**

**ORDER**

1. The present petition has been filed by the accused petitioner, namely, Santosh Paswan @ Santosh Kumar seeking anticipatory bail in apprehension of his arrest in connection with Singhiya P.S. Case No. 79 of 2025, registered under Sections 137(2), 96 read with 3(5) of the B.N.S.
2. Heard Sri Amrendra Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the accused petitioners and Sri Sitaram Yadav, Ld. APP. for the State.
3. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution based upon the application of the informant, Shiv Ram, is that on 09/05/25 at around 7:00 PM, all the accused individuals acting with a common intention, namely (01) Santosh Paswan, (02) Ram Ujagar Paswan, (03) Saurabh Paswan, (04) Karan Paswan, (05) Karan Ram and (06) Nitish Paswan, jointly kidnapped his minor daughter, Kavita Kumari (aged 17 years), from his house by forcibly forcing her into a vehicle and driving away. The informant expressed his apprehension that the accused persons might rape and murder his daughter. He further explained that the delay in lodging the application at the police station was due to ongoing efforts to resolve the matter through a local social panchayat.
4. Ld. Counsel for the accused petitioners submits that no regular bail or anticipatory bail petition has previously been filed or is pending before this Court or any higher Court. It is further submitted that the petitioners have no criminal antecedent and that the allegations levelled against them are wholly false, concocted, and baseless. The petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case due to ulterior motives. It is further submitted that victim has stated in her statement recorded under Sections 183 of Cr.P.C that she was not kidnapped and she was major and she has voluntarily married with the petitioner. It is further submitted that victim is living with the petitioner. It is further submitted that victim is major at the time of marriage and FIR has been filed with delay. The petitioner apprehend his arrest by the police and undertake to cooperate with the investigation. They are ready to furnish adequate bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Court, and there is no likelihood of their absconding or tampering with the evidence or influencing the witnesses.
5. On the other hand Ld. APP. on behalf of state opposed the prayer for bail on the ground of gravity of allegations.
6. Perused the records. The instant case has been instituted under Sections 137(2) and 96 read with Section 3(5) of the B.N.S. against the accused persons, including the present petitioner, on the allegation that the petitioner kidnapped the victim being the minor daughter of the informant. As per the application of the informant, victim was taken away by the accused including the present petitioner on 09.05.2025 and as per the FIR, information was

**In the Court of Dushyant Kumar**  
**District & Additional Sessions Judge-I**  
**Rosera , District-Samastipur**  
**A.B.P. No. 451-C of 2025**  
**C.I.S.No. 451-Cof 2025**  
**(Arising out of Singhiya P.S. Case No. 79 of 2025)**  
**Date: 19.05.2026**

received on 18.05.2025. As far as age of the victim is concerned, educational certificate reveals the date of birth as 16.05.2007. As per the medical report, her age has been stated be 19 years. In her statement recorded under Sections 183 of ob BNSS, she has stated that she is 18 years old and she got married with the petitioner on 16.05.2025 and she wishes to live with her husband. Thus at the time of marriage, petitioner appears to be major. There is nothing in her statement indicating any force or intimidation.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case especially the statement of victim indicating that is married with the petitioner and she was major at the time of marriage, custodial detention of the petitioner does not appear to be warranted in this case as the same shall serve no useful purpose and in view of the same, this Court is inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this stage.
8. Accordingly, the petitioner, namely Santosh Paswan @ Santosh Kumar is directed to be released on bail in the event of his arrest or surrender before Court within six weeks on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the Court of the Ld. Magistrate concerned in connection with Singhiya P.S. Case No. 79 of 2025, subject to furnishing of undertaking regarding compliance of the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of BNSS.
9. Let a copy of this order along with the LCR be sent to the Court of the Ld. Magistrate concerned in connection with Singhiya PS Case 79 of 2025.

Dictated

District & Additional Sessions Judge -1  
Rosera, Samastipur