

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80563 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-182 Year-2019 Thana- PANDAUL District- Madhubani

SONU KUMAR PANJIYAR @ SONU PANJIYAR, aged about 20 years, S/o
Pradeep Panjiyar R/o Village- Pluest Karpuri Chowk, P.S.- Pandaul, District-
Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Akhileshwar Dayal

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR TRIVEDI
ORAL ORDER

4 15-07-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as
learned A.P.P. alongwith learned counsel for the informant.

From the previous order sheets, it has been perceived
that the parties were given an opportunity to get the matter
amicably sorted out but, as submitted by learned counsel for the
petitioner, now the petitioner does not want to continue with the
relationship and acknowledge the informant as his wife after
solemnization of the marriage. So, this petition be disposed of
on its merit.

The teenage, as per psychiatrist, has always been
considered as volatile one, having been exploited at the end of
the petitioner, who enticed away the informant to Bangalore and
on the false pretext of marriage, remained in her company for



three months developing physical relationship and then, kicked her out.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case and further, considering the age of the victim to be of majority (18 years), full sense of understanding whereunder she consented and that consent could be out of free will and volition and so, no offence under section 366A or 376 I.P.C. is made out, rather in worst case, it could be under section 420 I.P.C. whereupon, the petitioner could be entitled for an anticipatory bail.

Learned A.P.P. alongwith learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer and submitted that the whole event was managed by the petitioner under deceptive mind, which is apparent from his conduct, accordingly did not warrant anticipatory bail.

Regard being had to the facts and circumstances of the case, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Aditya Kumar Trivedi, J)

Surendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

