

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21122 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-215 Year-2021 Thana- PUPRI District- Sitamarhi

1. Md. Aasif Son Of Md. Jahir @ Madani R/O- Village- Yahiyapur, P.S.- Pupri, District- Sitamarhi
2. Md. Seraj @ Md. Saroj Son Of Md. Shamse Alam R/O- Village- Yahiyapur, P.S.- Pupri, District- Sitamarhi

..... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

..... Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Umesh Chandra Verma
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Syed Mojibur Rahman

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

3 01-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
APP for the State.

The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Pupri P.S. Case No. 215 of 2021, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 354(B), 354(D), 509, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 18 of the POCSO Act.

The prosecution case as per F.I.R is that the petitioners used to pass lewd comments on the daughter of the informant, teased her and when the informant made protest, they threatened to kidnap her daughter who is minor aged about 16 years.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners



that petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case. The police, after completing investigation has submitted final form and not sent up the petitioners for trial. However, learned Court below, differing with the final form, has taken cognizance against them.

Learned APP appearing for the State and learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail and submitted that the victim was minor at the time of occurrence. The petitioners often used to pass lewd comments and threatened her. It is further submitted that the petitioners threatened her of kidnapping. Victim as well as witnesses also supported the prosecution case vide para 4, 5, 6 of the Case Diary. It is also submitted that cognizance has been taken against the petitioners by the cognizance taking court.

Considering the above-stated facts, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners stands rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

nirajkrs/-

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

