

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.110 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-480 Year-2021 Thana- MAJHAULIA District- West Champaran

SUGANDH KUMAR @ SUGANDH KUMAR RAM SON OF MADAN
RAM R/O VILLAGE- GUDARA, WARD NO.-03, P.S.- MAJHAULIA,
DISTRICT- WEST CHAMPARAN

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjeev Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Umesh Kumar Gupta
Mr. Binod Kumar

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 01-08-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to

remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within

one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the

offences alleged under Sections 302 and 374 of the Indian Penal

Code and Section 4/6 of the POCSO Act, registered in

connection with Majhauria P.S.Case No. 480 of 2021.

One day prior to the occurrence, the petitioner came

to the house of the informant Sona Devi and asked her that he

would come to her house at night. At about 11.00 A.M. he



knocked at her door whereupon her sister-in-law Rinki Devi prohibited and also stated that had he made persistent knock he shall be beaten with chappal. The petitioner went away and in the morning the minor daughter of the informant was missing. The daughter of the sister-in-law apprised the informant that it was the petitioner who enticed away the daughter of the sister-in-law of the informant and also the daughter of the informant on the pretext of providing chocolates. Later on, the dead-body of the minor daughter of the informant was found.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the informant has submitted that the minor daughter of the sister-in-law of the informant was also enticed away with the daughter of the informant who apprised the informant that it was the petitioner who enticed away the deceased on the promise to provide her chocolates and thereafter the dead-body of the deceased was found.

In view of aforesaid allegation, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. His prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

Office shall ensure that all 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)

HR/-

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

