

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20529 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-77 Year-2021 Thana- SAHODARA District- West Champaran

RANJEET MANJHI @ BADI SON OF HARDEO MANJHI R/O VILLAGE-
BANSPUR, P.S.- SAHODRA, DISTRICT- WEST CHAMPARAN

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rishabh Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Asha Devi, A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER**

3 30-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

Let the defect(s), if any, be removed within a period
of four weeks.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 363 and
366(A) of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 8 and 18 of the
POCSO Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent.

The informant alleges that on 01.09.2021, at about
09:00 p.m., his minor sister had gone to attend the call of nature
when six named accused including the petitioner kidnapped her
for wrong reasons. It is further alleged that the informant



apprehends that his sister may be killed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the date of occurrence is 01.09.2021 and the date of FIR is 03.09.2021. It is next submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that as to why the statement of the victim was not recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. when she has come back. It is also submitted that from perusal of her statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C., it would manifest that she only alleges that she was taken to the house of Ranjeet Manjhi and when the present FIR came to be instituted the mother of Ranjeet Manjhi brought her back to her home. It is thus submitted that no occurrence as alleged had taken place and the victim was staying in her house but only to falsely implicate the petitioner, the present false case came to be instituted. It is further submitted that even the victim in her statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. does not allege any sexual assault, misbehaviour or inappropriate behaviour by the petitioner against her.

Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

Considering the submissions made by the learned



counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Sahodra P.S. Case No. 77 of 2021, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

