

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.41286 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-21 Year-2021 Thana- KUNDWACHAINPUR District- East
Champaran

Sanjeev Kumar Ranjan Son of Nayak Manjhi Resident of Village- Salempur,
P.S.- Town, District- Saran at Chapra.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vinay Ranjan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

4 29-11-2021 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is expected

to honour his undertaking given in the instant case for

depositing the requisite court fee and to remove the

defects as pointed out by the office when called upon

to do so by the office.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a

case registered for the offences punishable under

Sections 149, 342, 450, 376(DB), 302, 201, 120B of

the Indian Penal Code and Section 4 and 5 of the



Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act.

It is alleged by the informant that he is resident of Nepal and works as a tea hawker in the local market of Chainpur. It is further alleged that while the informant and his wife went to Nepal, his minor daughter aged about 12 years, stayed in the rented house was raped and murdered and her dead body was cremated forcefully by the accused persons on 21.01.2021.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that at the relevant time, the petitioner was posted as SHO Kundwa Chainpur police station East Champaran. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

Considering the fact that the role of the present petitioner came fore when one audio clip was made viral, which disclosed the talk with the FIR named accused Ramesh and the same is mentioned in



para 114 of the case diary. Perusal of the conversation discloses as to the alleged active participation of the petitioner into the incident and also the fact that the petitioner himself appears to be suggesting the accused persons for disposal of dead body of the victim, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

However, if the petitioner surrenders before the Court below within a period of four weeks from today, the Court below may consider the prayer for bail of the petitioner, without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Jagdish/-

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

