

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra
Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 623 of 2026 (Baniyapur P.S. Case No. 65/2026)

Pramod Raut & Anr. V/s State of Bihar

ORDER

S.No.	Date	Contents	Remarks
01	10.03.2026	<p>1. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioners-accused as well as learned Public Prosecutor representing the State on anticipatory bail petition of petitioners-accused, namely, <i>i. Pramod Raut and ii. Guddu Raut @ Batak</i>, apprehending their arrest in this Baniyapur P.S. Case No. 65/2026, registered under Sections 137(2) and 96 of the BNS, pending in the Court of <i>Smt. Chitra Kundan</i>, learned JMFC, Saran at Chapra.</p> <p>2. FIR of this case has been registered on the basis of a written application of the informant, namely, <i>Kanhaiya Raut</i> (victim's father), stating that on 27.01.2026 at about 10:00 A.M., his daughter, namely, <i>Sulochana Kumari @ Rimmi Kumari</i>, went to "Puchhari Bazar" to get her bicycle repaired, but she did not return till evening. Thereafter, the informant search for her, but he did not find her. The informant suspected that the petitioners-accused along with one other co-accused absconded her daughter.</p> <p>3. It is contended on behalf of learned counsel representing the petitioners-accused that they are quite innocent and have not committed any offence as alleged in F.I.R. Next contended that earlier no ABP or regular bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioners-accused in this Court or Hon'ble High Court, Patna in connection with the present case and they got clean antecedent except this one. Next added that the allegations levelled against the petitioners-accused are absolutely false and manufactured. Next added that the victim has been recovered by the Police and her statement has also been recorded. Further submitted that at the time of occurrence, the petitioners-accused were present at their house. The petitioners-accused are ready to furnish sureties as required by the Court. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioners-accused may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.</p> <p>4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor representing the State vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners-accused.</p> <p>5. Heard both the sides and perused the relevant materials available on record. From the record, the allegation is that the petitioners-accused absconded the informant's daughter. However, the victim girl, namely, <i>Sulochana Kumari @ Rimmi Kumari</i>, has been recovered by the Police, and her statement u/s 183 of B.N.S.S. has also been recorded in which she has stated that she left her house without informing anyone. Thereafter, co-accused, <i>Sanket Kumar</i> and the petitioner-accused <i>Pramod Raut</i></p>	

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra
Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 623 of 2026 (Baniyapur P.S. Case No. 65/2026)

Pramod Raut & Anr. V/s State of Bihar

ORDER

	<p>made her unconscious and took her to Delhi with them.</p> <p>6. So, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the victim's categorical statement, and the reasons mentioned herein-above, the bail application of the petitioner-accused no.2, namely, Guddu Raut @ Batak, is allowed, whereas the bail application of the petitioner-accused no.1, namely, Pramod Raut, stands rejected.</p> <p>7. Therefore, this Anticipatory Bail Petition, bearing No. 623 of 2026, is hereby allowed only for the petitioner no. 2. In the event of his arrest or surrender within one month from this order, the petitioner-accused, namely, Guddu Raut @ Batak, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- <u>with two sureties</u> of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court concerned subject to the conditions as laid down u/s 482(2) of B.N.S.S., 2023 :-</p> <p>(I) That the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by I.O., as and when required,</p> <p>(II) That the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to the I.O. of the case,</p> <p>(III) That the petitioner shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court,</p> <p>(IV) That the petitioner is directed to co-operate in trial and disposal of the case.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[Dictated]</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Puneet Kumar Garg), Sessions Judge, Saran 10.03.2026</p>	