

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Supaul
B.A.-118/2026
(Arising out of Triveniganj P.S. Case No.11/2026)

	<p>Rahul Kumar, S/o- Sanjay Sardar, R/o- Latauna, Ward No.10, Shivnagar, PS-Triveniganj, District- Supaul;</p> <p style="text-align: right;">.....Accused/Petitioner</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Vs.</p> <p>State of Bihar</p> <p style="text-align: right;">.....O.P.</p>	
<p><u>16/03/26</u></p>	<p>Ld. Counsel for petitioner Sri. Nand Kishor Yadav, Advocate.</p> <p>Ld. PP Sri. J.N.Pandey, for the State.</p> <p>Ld. counsel for informant Sri. Dharendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate.</p> <p>By this order we are going to dispose off the bail application filed on behalf of the accused/ petitioner, namely Rahul Kumar, who is in judicial custody since 15.01.2026 in connection with Triveniganj PS Case No.:– 11/26, u/s- 87, 81 of B.N.S.</p> <p>Ld. counsel for the accused/ petitioner argued that accused/ petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no crime and he has falsely been implicated in this case due to local politics and enmity. He further submitted that accused/ petitioner is not involved in any other case and having the clean antecedent. He further submitted that the offence as alleged in FIR is not applicable against the accused/ petitioner. It is also submitted that accused/ petitioner is in judicial custody since 15.01.2026 and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the accused/ petitioner behind the bar.</p> <p>Ld. PP for the State strongly opposed the prayer of bail application.</p> <p>In brief, the prosecution story is that on dated 12.12.2025 at about 05:00 P.M., the daughter of the informant, aged about 19 years was taken away by the accused Rahul Kumar for the purpose of solemnizing the marriage. The informant further alleged that accused Rahul Kumar has kept his daughter at his house for about 5 days. Thereafter, he has ran away from there leaving behind the victim. The informant further alleged that the victim has also stated to him that accused Rahul Kumar was willing to solemnize the marriage with her but Sanjay Sardar and Gita Devi have demanded the dowry of Rs.2 lakh, thereafter the marriage will be solemnized and the victim was left by Rahul Kumar at the house of informant. The informant further alleged that under the pressure of his parents, accused Rahul Kumar is not willing to solemnize the marriage with his daughter. Thereafter, the Panchayat was also organized in the village and Sanjay Sardar was not willing to obey the direction of the Panchayat.</p> <p>Argument heard from both sides and perused the record as well as case diary. Admittedly, this accused/ petitioner is in judicial custody since 15.01.2026. On going through the case diary, it transpires that the police also recorded the statement of the witnesses namely Sunita Devi(who is the mother of the victim), Dipnarayan Sardar, Rupa Devi, Renu Devi and Anari Devi and all the witnesses have stated in the same line as stated</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Contd.</p>

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Supaul

B.A.-118/2026

(Arising out of Triveniganj P.S. Case No.11/2026)

Contd...
16/03/26

by the informant. In para No.22 of the case diary, the police also recorded the statement of the victim and as per the statement of the victim, she was developed the friendship with the accused through Instagram Social Media and the accused has called the victim several times in his room and also established the physical relation with the victim. As per para No.28 of the case diary, the victim has also stated before the Ld. Magistrate that the accused Rahul Kumar is known to her since last 4 months and he has called in his room and establish the physical relation with her and also promised her to solemnize the marriage. Thereafter, his father has demanded the dowry of Rs.5 lakh. In para No.38 and 39 of the case diary, the victim was also taken to hospital for medical examination. However, the I.O has not mentioned about the medical report submitted by the doctor in the case diary. On minute scrutiny of the entire case diary, it transpires that the accused Rahul Kumar has called the victim to his house and on the false pretext of the marriage, developed the physical relation with the victim. Though the victim is aged about 19 years, but keeping in mind that the accused Rahul Kumar has establish the physical relation without the consent of the victim. The allegation against this accused/ petitioner is very serious in nature. The investigation of this case is in primary stage. There is strong apprehension of tempering of the prosecution evidence by the accused/ petitioner.

Hence, taking into consideration the seriousness of the allegation, I find that accused/ petitioner is not entitled to be enlarged on bail. Therefore, the bail application, filed on behalf of accused/petitioner, namely Rahul Kumar stands, **Rejected.**

Dictated
-Sd-
(Anant Singh)
Sessions Judge, Supaul