

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30167 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-9 Year-2022 Thana- BANDHUWA KURAWA District- Banka

Ranjeet Kumar Yadav, Son of Rajendar Yadav, Resident of Village - Nunudih,
P.S.- Banka, Distt.- Banka.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Brij Nandad Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anand Mohan Prasad Mehta, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 16-09-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State through video conferencing.

Let the defect (s), as pointed out by the office, be removed within a period of four weeks from the date of resumption of physical filing and physical removal of defect.

In the present case, the petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bandhua Kurawa P.S. Case No. 09 of 2022, registered for the alleged offences under Sections 376 and 511 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per the prosecution case, the petitioner entered into the house of the complainant/informant in the night and made an attempt to commit rape with her. The petitioner also threatened the informant with life if she told about this occurrence to any one.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case and no occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. The allegation of rape has not been substantiated by any medical report. The learned counsel further submits that the occurrence is stated to have taken place on 28.11.2021, but complaint to that effect has been filed only on 04.01.2022 and the FIR was instituted on 05.02.2022. The long delays have not been explained and it shows the case is based on concocted facts. The learned counsel further submits that the informant and the petitioner are agnates and there is a series of litigation between them and due to this animosity, the present case has been filed. The petitioner is in custody since 24.03.2022 and the charge sheet has been submitted in this case.

Learned APP opposes the prayer for bail submitting that the informant has explained the delay in her complaint itself and nothing regarding any earlier dispute has been brought on record by the petitioner. Moreover, there is specific allegation against this petitioner.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances and submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the specific allegation against the petitioner which is quite serious and grave, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at



this stage.

Accordingly, his prayer for bail is rejected.

However, learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same within six months.

If the trial is not concluded within the aforesaid period of six months, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

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

