

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3416 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-24 Year-2022 Thana- NAUHATTA District- Rohtas

=====

Rahul Kumar Son of Dinesh Chaudhary @ Dinesh Chaudhari, Resident of
Village- Nawadhih, P.S.- Nauhatta, District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umeshanand Pandit, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 08-02-2023 Let the defect(s), if any, be removed within two weeks
from today.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Nauhatta P.S. Case No. 24 of 2022(G.R. No.108/2022) lodged
under Sections 341, 323, 354(A), 354(B)/ 34 of the I.P.C. read
with Sections 67, 67(A), 66(E) the I.T. Act, 2008.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has earlier moved before this Hon'ble Court and the
bail application of the present petitioner has been rejected vide
order dated 22.09.2022 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 37337 of 2022.

In the rejection order, liberty was given to the
petitioner that he may renew his prayer for bail 1 year from the

date of passing of this order. The date of passing of order 22.09.2022 and as per the observation made in the bail application, liberty was granted to him to move before the Court on and after 22.09.2023.

But the present petitioner has moved before this Court prior to lapse of 1 year in this present bail application assigning the reason that the other co-accused persons have been granted bail by this Hon'ble Court in Cr. Misc. No. 58590 of 2022.

From the record, it transpires that the allegation of taking away victim in the field of *Arhar* crop with wrong intention and it was allegation against the accused persons that they have made her video, outraging her modesty and subsequently, made the said video viral on *Whatsapp*. From the F.I.R. and the Seizure list, it transpires that the said mobile has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the recovery of the said mobile has been made from the possession of the present petitioner whose bail application has been rejected.

In the present facts and circumstances of this case and the submissions made above, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the bail application of the petitioner is

hereby rejected.

The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as early as possible within 6 months.

With this observation, the bail application stands rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

prakashmani/-

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