

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32881 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-279 Year-2020 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Lakhisarai

Dr. Kritinidhi @ Dr. Sanjay Keshri @ Kritinidhi @ Sanjay Keshri, Son of Late Ramdas Keshri Resident of Village - BanSHIPur, P.S.- Mednichowki, District - Lakhisarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ekta Kumari Wife of Balraj Nanda @ Balram Yadav Resident of Village - Rasulpur, Post and P.S.- Mednichowki, District - Lakhisarai.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amrendra Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Veena Kumari Jaiswal, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

6 24-03-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the offences alleged under Sections 354(B), 354(A) and 354 of the IPC registered in connection with Complaint Case No.279(C) of 2020.

As per allegation, the complaint who is a second year student of G.N.M. in Vaishali Training School, was residing in her house as the college was closed. She was getting training



from the petitioner, who is a doctor. The petitioner, as per allegation, asked her to go inside the house and bring medicines. When she went, the petitioner followed her and came in that room and forcibly committed rape upon her. Due to fear, she did not disclosed the occurrence to her husband but after persistently asking of her husband, she disclosed the occurrence to her husband.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there is delay of three months in lodging the complaint. He has submitted further that the petitioner has falsely been implicated due to dirty village politics.

The reason of the delay has been explained in the complaint petition itself, which shows that due to fear, she did not narrate the occurrence to her husband and on persistent asking of her husband, she disclosed it on 07.09.2020. When the couple went to lodge FIR in police station, the present petitioner was present in the police station and it was the reason that the FIR could not be lodged.

In my view, it is not a fit case for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

Office shall ensure that all the defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time as provided



hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the
notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Prakash Narayan /-

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

