

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12923 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-175 Year-2020 Thana- DURAULI District- Siwan

=====

Rajeev Ranjan Pandey @ Sunny Pandey S/o Shambhu Pandey Resident of
Village- Ram Punak, P.S.- Darauli, District- Siwan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar Dwivedi

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.A.G.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

4 20-06-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a

case registered for the offences punishable under

Sections 341, 323, 337, 354, 376, 511, 504, 506, 34

of the Indian Penal Code and Section 12 of the

Protection of Children From Sexual Offences Act.

It is alleged by the informant that this

petitioner along with co-accused Pawan Singh tried to

outrage her modesty while she went to attend call of

nature. It is further alleged that when she came her

house and narrated the incidence to her family



members, the F.I.R named accused persons came at her door and assaulted the informant, her father, mother and brother. They also torn the clothes of the informant and tried to outrage her modesty. The father of the informant subsequently succumbed to the injuries.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner was not present on the alleged date and time of the occurrence, rather he was living at Nagpur on the alleged date.

It is submitted by learned A.P.P for the State that it is a case of heinous in nature and there is specific accusation against this petitioner that he made an attempt to outrage the modesty of the informant and due to assault made by the accused persons including the petitioner, the father of the informant succumbed to the injuries. The prosecution version of the informant has been supported by many witnesses which is evident from paragraph Nos. 110, 111, 112 of the case diary.



In the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner stands rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Shageer/-

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

