

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Vaishali
A.B.P. No. 1047/2026

1. Ranjeet Kumar, aged about 31 years, S/o Tuntun Ram, R/O of village-Bakaur, P.S. -
Islampur, Distt. - NalandaPetitioner

Versus

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. 180/2026 registered u/ss. 137(2) & 87 of B.N.S.

It is stated in Para 2 of the anticipatory bail petition that 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(informant) 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.

The learned counsel for the above named accused petitioner submits that the accused/petitioner is innocent, has committed no offence and he has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the alleged victim girl

(A.B.P. No.1047/2026)
(Ranjit Kumar Vs. State of Bihar)

Present : Harshit Singh, Sessions Judge, Vaishali

Contd.

22.05.2026

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. Besides this, the petitioner has no criminal antecedent. It is, therefore, the Ld. Counsel on behalf of petitioner prays to enlarge the petitioners on bail.

Learned P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

Heard both sides and perused the case record and materials available on record. It transpires that the petitioner is a named accused in the FIR and there is a specific allegation against him of kidnapping the victim girl. The witnesses, in paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the case diary, have supported the factum of occurrence. The victim girl, in her statement recorded u/ss 183 of B.N.S.S., has stated that she was in a love with the petitioner, Ranjit Kumar, and that she was living with him in a rented room at Anishabad, Patna, for a period of two months but did not solemnize marriage. The date of birth of victim child is 20.12.2008 and on the date of occurrence is on 04.11.2025 she was aged about 16 years, 10 months and 14 days.

Considering the nature and gravity of the offence, the manner of occurrence, and the involvement of the petitioner as disclosed during investigation, this Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. It is, therefore, the anticipatory bail of the petitioner namely Ranjit Kumar is hereby rejected.

(Dictated)

(Harshit Singh)

Sessions Judge, Vaishali

(A.B.P. No.1047/2026)
(Ranjit 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.