

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14799 of 2020**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-85 Year-2016 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Gaya

KARU DAS @ SUNIL KUMAR S/o Mundrika Das @ Mundrika Ravidas
Resident of Village- Manpur Pehani Bagicha Bhui Toli, P.S.- Buniyadganj,
Distt- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arvind Prasad Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jai Narain Thakur

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER**

2 07-07-2020 This case has been heard through video-conferencing.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Section 354 B, 376
& 511 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 12 of the POCSO
Act.

While the daughter of the informant was regressing
to her home after attending a party and when she reached near
the house of Rohit Yadav, the petitioner finding her alone is
said to have tried to outrage her modesty and after raising hulla
when the locals assembled there the petitioner made his good



escape.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that no such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He has been falsely implicated in this case due to animosity. As a matter of fact, the father of the victim girl is a wine Mafiya of the locality and large scale country made wine was stored in his house and the said fact was reported by the petitioner to the police and being infuriated with the same, the informant has lodged this false and frivolous case against the petitioner only with an intent to harass him. No statement of victim under Section 164 Cr.P.C. has been recorded before the Magistrate till date. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

On the other hand, learned APP for the State vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that there is serious allegation of trying to outrage the modesty of the victim girl is against the petitioner, hence he does not deserve anticipatory bail by this Court.

Considering the facts and circumstances of case and particularly considering the criminal antecedents, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the



learned Court below within six weeks from today and seek regular bail and the learned Court below would pass order in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

