

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.28672 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -333 Year- 2015 Thana -RAJIVNAGAR District- PATNA

=====

Rishi Kumar Sinha @ Rishi Sinha Son of Vinod Kumar Sinha, Resident of Village+Post Office- Kafan, Police Station- Hathauri, District- Muzaffarpur, A/p Vikash Bihar Colony, Dhanaut, Police Station- Rupaspur, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satya Prakash, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Jitendra Kumar Roy 1, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

5 30-08-2016 A supplementary affidavit has been filed on behalf of the petitioner enclosing the love letter written by the victim. Let the same be kept on record.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the informant and learned counsel for the State.

The petitioner is languishing in custody since 14.01.2016 in connection with Rajiv Nagar P.S. Case No. 333 of 2015 pending in the court of Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Patna registered for offences under Sections 366 and 366(A) of the Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 7.11.2015 at 4 P.M the informant dropped his daughter Priyanshu Kumari at Jagriti Coaching Centre and when at about 8 P.M he reached Coaching Centre, he got information that her daughter had left coaching on the pretext of stomach pain. Informant tried to

contact her on mobile but it was found switched off. He also came to know that petitioner had also left coaching on the same day at 5 p.m. He also stated that petitioner was harassing his daughter from earlier. He suspected that petitioner had kidnapped his daughter.

On behalf of the petitioner, it is submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 14.01.2016. Charge-sheet has been submitted in the present case. There is no allegation of tampering of witnesses alleged against the petitioner. He has falsely been implicated in the present case. As per prosecution case, the victim was teased for more than one month but she never protested at any point of time.

On behalf of the State and the counsel for the informant, it has been submitted that the petitioner is named in the F.I.R. 164 Cr.P.C. statement of the victim discloses that she was taken by the petitioner and sexually abused by him.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. The same is rejected. The court below is directed to take all necessary steps to expedite the trial of the petitioner.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

Prakash/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--