

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
(FROM RESIDENTIAL OFFICE VIA VIDEO APPLICATION)
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5896 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1069 Year-2018 Thana- SITAMARHI District- Sitamarhi

MANJOOR KHALIFA Son of Late Shankar Khalifa Resident of Village-
Khajurbanni Boha Tola, P.S.-Sitamarhi, District-Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate Mr. Pushendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Akhileshwar Dayal, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER**

2 01-07-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

The petitioner in the present case is seeking anticipatory bail in connection with Sitamarhi P.S. Case No. 1069 of 2018 registered for the offences under Sections 363, 365, 370, 370(A), 372, 373, 376, 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code, Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 of the Immoral Traffic Act, Sections 4/6 of POCSO Act and Section 75 of J.J. Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations against the petitioner are false and he has been implicated in this case only because of his criminal antecedent.

Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Attention of this Court has been drawn towards the allegations against the petitioner as



made in the first information report. It is submitted that the petitioner was allegedly engaged in business of prostitution and for this he was alluring the the victim girls. In the impugned order learned Sessions Judge while rejecting the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner visited the materials collected by the Investigating Officer in course of investigation. It has come that some of the victims have in their statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. stated the name of the petitioner and others who allegedly committed rape with them in his house.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and there being serious kind of allegations against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. His prayer for anticipatory bail is refused.

The application stands dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

avin/-

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

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

