

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.28890 of 2016**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -48 Year- 2015 Thana -RAJAPAKAR District- VAISHALI(HAJIPUR)

=====

Kallu Rai @ Kaltu Rai @ Kalpu Rai S/o Late Tetar Yadav Resident of  
Village- Sonapur, P.S.- Sonapur, District- Saran (Chapra)

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... .... Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajit Ranjan Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajballabh Singh, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR**  
**JHA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      26-10-2016                      Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Rajapakar P.S.  
Case No. 48/2015, registered for the offences punishable under  
Sections 366A, 376 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code and  
Sections 4 and 6 of the P.O.C.S.O. Act.

The informant filed a complaint petition bearing no.  
02/2015 on the basis of which the present F.I.R. was lodged. The  
victim/informant made allegation that her mother fell in love with  
Kallu Rai @ Kaltu Rai @ Kalpu Rai (petitioner) and she  
solemnized marriage with him. Kallu Rai and her mother Munni  
Devi sold her to Arjun Rai, Niraj Sinha and Bullu Rai. They all  
sexually exploited her.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only

allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner solemnized marriage with the mother of the victim, but no specific allegation against the petitioner is made. The victim made her further statement in the case diary and she did not make any allegation that the petitioner received any money from other accused persons for selling the minor girl, but it appears that the victim herself disclosed that petitioner and her mother sold her to other accused persons on payment of Rs. 25,000/-. Other accused persons sexually exploited her for many days. The victim is aged about ten years.

Considering the facts aforesaid and nature of allegation made against the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above-named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

**(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)**

Vinita/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|