

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63483 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-213 Year-2021 Thana- KAUWAKOL District- Nawada

Ramesh Kumar @ Gully Yadav @ Gully, Son of Krishna Yadav Resident of
Guaghoghara, P.S.- Kauwakol, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anuj Kumar, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dilip Kumar No. 1, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 08-08-2022 Heard Mr. Anuj Kumar, learned counsel appearing on
behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Dilip Kumar No.1, learned
A.P.P. for the State.

Let the defect(s), if any, be removed within two
weeks of the complete start of the physical Court in normal
course.

The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Kauwakol P.S. Case No. 213 of 2021 for the offence punishable
under Sections 341, 354A, 504 and 506/34 of the Indian Penal
Code.

As per the allegation made in the F.I.R., the petitioner
used to make vulgar comments and has made some
objectionable photographs viral on Whatsapp and Facebook by
editing the photographs of the two daughters of the informant.



Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that no such act as alleged in the F.I.R. has been committed by the petitioner rather the present F.I.R. has been lodged at the behest of the local police because nine cases are pending against the petitioner. He further submits that taking into consideration the period of custody and the nature of allegation made in the F.I.R., the petitioner may be released on bail on any condition imposed by this Court. Charge sheet has already been submitted in the present case, from which it appears that in course of investigation no incriminating material has been recovered nor the Investigating Officer has been able to gather any material as to whether the petitioner was engaged in cropping / editing the photographs of the daughter of the informant.

Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. He submitted that as per the statement made in Para-3 of the bail application, several cases are pending against the petitioner and for the similar allegation earlier also the petitioner has been made accused.

Having heard the rival submission of the parties and taking into consideration the antecedent of the petitioner and the allegation made in the F.I.R., I am not inclined to enlarge the



petitioner on bail.

Accordingly, the present bail application is rejected.

The trial court is directed to conclude the trial expeditiously well within a period of one year.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

mantreshwar/-

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

