

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2456 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-67 Year-2021 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Rohtas

Sunil Sah @ Tempu Sah @ Lempu Sah Son Of Surendra Sah R/O Village-
Jayshree, P.S.- Karakat (GORARI), District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shankar Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Anurag Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 29-11-2022 Heard Ld. counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Mahila
P.S. Case No. 67 of 2021, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 341, 323, 376, 504, 506 and 34
of the Indian Penal Code and Section 4 of POCSO Act.

The prosecution case as emerging from the FIR is
that when the minor daughter of the informant, Priyanshu
Kumari, went outside her house, the petitioner took her
away to his house and ravished her.

Ld. counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this



case. He further submits that charge-sheet has been submitted and even charge has been framed.

The petitioner has been languishing in jail since 20.09.2021.

It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the petition that the petitioner has not moved before this Court for grant of either anticipatory or regular bail in this regard.

It has further been stated in paragraph no. 3 that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

However, the learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the petitioner for bail submitting that the allegation is serious in nature and is also supported by statement of the minor victim recorded under Section 164 Cr. P.C.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

The application stands rejected accordingly.

However, if the trial is not concluded in the next six months, he may renew his prayer for bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to



remove all the defects, if any, pointed out by the office within a period of one month and the Registry is directed to issue the certified copy of this order only after removal of office objections.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

ramesh/-

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

