

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15879 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-173 Year-2014 Thana- ARA MUFFSIL District- Bhojpur

MANTU RAI @ RAVI VIKESH Son of Rajendra Rai R/o Village - Jamira,
P.S.- Ara Muffasil, Dist.- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Rai, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 23-05-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 173 of 2014 for the offence registered under sections 366A, 341, 342, 323, 376D, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code and section 6 of the POCSO Act lodged on 13.08.2014 by the informant, Ram Bihari Rai.

The prosecution case in short is that the informant alleged that on 20/7/2014 at 7 PM petitioners along with others arrived at his house and took away his daughter Seema Kumari. As later she could not be traced out and for that purpose, a Panchayat was organized but the accuseds didn't agree to obey the opinion of Panchayat and further took daughter in a vehicle standing on the Chandi Jameera road.



It is further alleged that accused Mantu and Dharmendra took her to unknown place and established physical relationship with her and did not leave her even after her resistance. It is further alleged that one Sona Rai alleged neighbour of the informant as well as Rajendra Rai committed rape on the victim and on 10/8/2014, they carried her on motorcycle in '*Mahabir Tola*' in the house of relative and threatened her of dire consequences and on 12/8/2014, the victim was left near Ara Muffasil P.S. then she was taken to her house by Krishna Ram. Accordingly, the FIR.

The matter is of 2014 and as per the observation of the learned Sessions Judge showing them as an absconder, the charge sheet has been submitted under sections 366A, 342, 323, 376D, 504/34 of the Indian Penal Code and section 6 of the POCSO Act.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation are not supported by the medical evidence, no independent witnesses have supported the prosecution story and according to the learned Counsel, the entire case is false and fabricated.

Learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail stating that the matter is of 2014



and charge sheet stands submitted showing them as absconder.

In view of the aforesaid facts, no relief can be granted to him. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Neha/-

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

