

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Vaishali
A.B.P. No. 805/2026

1. Gopal Kumar, aged about 30 years, S/o- Tuntun Ram, Resident of village-Bakaur, P.S. - Islampur, District-Nalanda.

- Petitioner

Verses

State of Bihar

- O.P.

Appearance : -

Learned counsel for the petitioner : - Sri. Ramnath Sharma, advocate.

Learned P.P. for the State : - Sri Shyam Babu Rai,

Present : Harshit Singh,
Sessions Judge, Vaishali.

Date of order: - 22nd May 2026

Heard the learned defence counsel as well as learned Public Prosecutor on the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the above named accused petitioner under section 482 of B.N.S.S. who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Ganga Bridge P.S. Case No. 180/2025 registered u/ss. 137(2) & 87 of B.N.S.

It is stated in Para 2 of the anticipatory bail petition that earlier no bail application either anticipatory or regular has been filed in the present case either before this court of Sessions or before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna.

The prosecution case, in brief, is that the informant's sister-in-law, Khushbu Kumari, had been residing at her brother-in-law's house for the last six months for the purpose of her studies. On 04.11.2025, when the informant and his wife returned home, they found that Khushbu Kumari was missing. During the subsequent search, it came to the informant's knowledge that the accused persons Ranjit Kumar, Tuntun Ram, Gopal Kumar, Nitish Kumar, Parvati Devi and four unknown persons with wrongful intention has abducted Khushbu Kumari. When the informant and his wife enquired at their house, they also discovered that some ornaments, clothes, and cash were missing from their house.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted by the Ld. Counsel on behalf of petitioner that the allegations made in the FIR are wholly

Present : Harshit Singh, Sessions Judge, Vaishali

Contd.

22.05.2026

misconceived and contrary to the actual facts of the case. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is employed in the Merchant Navy and was residing outside India during the alleged occurrence. It is further submitted that the alleged victim girl herself appeared before the Ganga Bridge Police and in her statement recorded under Section 180 BNSS stated that she had voluntarily gone to the house of her friend, namely Pratigya Kumari, at Anishabad. Learned counsel submits that the victim has not supported the allegation of kidnapping against the petitioner. It is also submitted that the alleged occurrence took place on 04.11.2025, whereas the petitioner had already left India after joining the Merchant Navy on 13.07.2025 and had proceeded to Dongguan, China, and thereafter to Istanbul, Romania. In support thereof, photocopies of service slips, air tickets, boarding pass, and travel documents have been brought on record, which prima facie indicate that the petitioner was outside India on the alleged date of occurrence and returned to India only on 08.03.2026. Besides this, the petitioner has no criminal antecedent. Hence, a prayer has been made to allow this anticipatory bail petition.

The learned Public Prosecutor for the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

Heard both sides and perused the case diary as well as other materials available on record. From perusal of the materials on record, it appears that there are allegations against the petitioner, namely *Gopal Kumar*, along with other accused persons, namely Ranjit Kumar, Tuntun Ram, Nitish Kumar, Parvati Devi and four unknown accused persons, regarding kidnapping of the victim girl. However, there appears to be contradiction in the statements of the victim recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of the B.N.S.S. In her statement recorded under Section 180 B.N.S.S., the victim stated that on the date of occurrence she had voluntarily gone to Anishabad to the house of her friend, namely Pratigya Kumari. Further, in her statement recorded under Section 183 B.N.S.S., she stated that she was in love with co-accused Ranjit Kumar since the year 2023 and as her family members intended to solemnize her marriage with another boy, she voluntarily left her house and went to Anishabad along with Ranjit

Present : Harshit Singh, Sessions Judge, Vaishali

Contd.

22.05.2026

Kumar, where she resided with him for a period of two months. It further transpires from the materials available on record that the alleged occurrence took place on 04.11.2025, whereas the present petitioner had already left India after joining the Merchant Navy on 13.07.2025 and had proceeded to Dongguan, China, and thereafter to Istanbul, Romania. In support thereof, photocopies of service slips, air tickets, boarding pass and other travel documents have been brought on record, which prima facie indicate that the petitioner was outside India on the alleged date of occurrence and returned to India only on 08.03.2026. Moreover, there appears to be no specific allegation against the present petitioner regarding active participation in the alleged occurrence of kidnapping or abduction. The principal allegation of enticing and taking away the victim has been attributed against co-accused Ranjit Kumar. However, the other accused of this case namely Nitish Kumar @ Vikral Kumar has already been granted regular bail by the Hon'ble High Court, Patna on 15.04.2026 vide Cr. Misc. No. 7404 of 2026 and Parvati Devi and Tuntun Ram has been granted bail anticipatory bail dated 22.04.2026 vide Cr. Misc. No. 8678 of 2026.

Therefore, Considering the nature of accusation, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, which appears to be limited in nature, and the fact and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the above named petitioner is hereby, allowed and it is ordered that in the event of arrest or surrender, he will be enlarged on anticipatory bail, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below, within four weeks of this order, subject to the conditions as laid down under section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita 2023.

(Dictated)

(Harshit Singh)
Sessions Judge, Vaishali

(A.B.P. No.805/2026)
(Gopal Kumar Vs. State of Bihar)

Present : Harshit Singh, Sessions Judge, Vaishali

Contd.

22.05.2026

Date of Order	22.05.2026
Date of Uploading	25.05.2026
Uploaded by	A.K.