

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - IV
DISTRICT – SHEOHAR**

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

Anticipatory Bail Petition (A.B.P.) No. 188 / 2026

(Arising out of Piprahi P.S. Case No. 66/2026 U/s. 137(2), 96, 3(5) B.N.S.)

1. Ankush Sah, aged about 30 yrs
2. Vinod Baitha, aged about 28 yrs

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Bihar.....Opposite Party

Appearance -

For the Petitioners : Sri Yogendra Sah, Sri Amit Kumar, Advocates

For the State : Sri Arshad Siddiqui, Addl. Public Prosecutor, Sheohar.

ORDER

18.05.2026

The learned advocates for the petitioners and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor have been heard at length. Perused the up to date copy of the case diary.

This petition for grant of anticipatory bail was filed on 21.04.2026 on behalf of Ankush Sah and Vinod Baitha who apprehend arrest in connection with Piprahi P.S. Case No. 66/2026 U/s. 137(2), 96, 3(5) B.N.S.

The prosecution's case in brief is that at about 7:30 P.M. on 07.03.2026, the informant's minor daughter Suman Kumari had gone out of home but when she did not return after sometime, the informant started looking for her and came to know that Dipak Paswan, Sahindra Paswan, Vinod Baitha and Ankush Sah had kidnapped his daughter. It is further alleged that earlier the informant would get calls on his mobile number from mobile no. 7559309172 during the month preceding the occurrence, and when the informant made a call on that number, it was taken by Dipak Paswan, who told him that he had taken away the informant's daughter with the aid of other co-accused and that he would sell the informant's daughter if the informant approached the police or filed any complaint in a Court.

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - IV
DISTRICT – SHEOHAR**

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

**A.B.P. No. 188 / 2026
Ankush Sah & Anr. Vs. State of Bihar**

ORDER

18.05.2026 It has been averred at the outset in para 2 of the petition that the petitioners have not filed any anticipatory bail petition before this Court or in Patna High Court, and in para 3 that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent. It is further argued and submitted that the petitioners are innocent and falsely implicated through a well-planned conspiracy. It is therefore, prayed that the petitioners may be granted privilege of anticipatory bail.

The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail petition mainly on the ground that the allegations were serious and pertained to offences which were non-bailable, triable by the Sessions Court and punishable with imprisonment for a term extending to ten years and with fine.

Now, it transpires from perusal of record that the petitioners are named as accused in this case and the allegations have been supported by the informant and three other witnesses in their statements as recorded during the investigation. As per para 26 of the case diary, the date of birth of the victim is 30.06.2011 which suggests that she was a minor on the date of occurrence. It is also evident that victim has not been recovered so far and the involvement of the petitioners has not been ruled out at this stage. On the other hand, no concrete material has been brought up to suggest that the petitioners were falsely implicated. The investigation is continuing.

In view of the above facts and circumstances and also considering the serious nature of allegation, I do not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. As such, the prayer is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated & Corrected)

Sd/-

Addl. Sessions Judge, IV
Sheohar