

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.41759 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-259 Year-2020 Thana- DAUDPUR District- Saran

=====

DEEPAK KUMAR SINGH SON OF MANOJ SINGH R/O VILLAGE-
MATHANPURA, P.S.- EKMA, DISTRICT- SARAN

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bishwajeet Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Uma Shankar Prasad Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

5 17-02-2023 Heard Ld. counsel for the petitioner and Ld.

APP for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Daudpur P.S. Case No. 259 of 2020, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 354-B, 420, and 509 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 67 of Information and Technology Act.

The prosecution case as merging from the FIR is that the petitioner used to run forged face book in the name of Nilu Singh Rajput, wife of the Informant and on which he used to post vulgar photographs of her.

Ld. counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that there is complete denial of the allegation, showing that there is material in the case-diary which may connect the petitioner with the alleged offence. He also submits that the mobile number which has been mentioned in the FIR do not belong to the petitioner. He further submits that investigation in this case is complete and charge-sheet has already been submitted.

He further submits that the petitioner has been languishing in jail since 09.04.2022.

It has also been stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one.

However, Ld. APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the petitioner for bail saying that after investigation, the allegation against the petitioner is found to be true.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances,



particularly the nature of allegation and material on record, I am not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

This application stands rejected accordingly.

However, Ld. Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial. In case, the trial is not concluded within a period of six months, the petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

Ld. counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove all the defects, if any, pointed out by the office within a period of one month and the Registry is directed to issue the certified copy of this order only after removal of office objections.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

ashishkr/-

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

