

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.62715 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-58 Year-2023 Thana- DEV District- Aurangabad

-
1. RANJAN KUMAR S/o- BALIRAM YADAV @ BALRAM YADAV
Village- Pathakbigha Ps- Dev Dist- Aurangabad
 2. Pappu Kumar son of Lalan Yadav Village- Pathakbigha Ps- Dev Dist-
Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kamlendra Pd. Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Zainul Abedin, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 16-10-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission
to withdraw this application in respect of petitioner no.1
submitting that during pendency of this application petitioner
no.1 has already been apprehended by the police.

3. Permission is granted.

4. Accordingly, this application is dismissed as
withdrawn in respect of petitioner no.1.

5. Now, this application survives for petitioner no.2 only.

6. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323,



354, 354A, 354B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 67(B) of the I.T. Act and Section 8/12 of the POCSO Act.

7. Allegedly, all the FIR named accused persons including these petitioners came to the informant's minor daughter in intoxicated condition and tried to outrage her modesty. On objection, they tore her cloths and threatened to make her photos viral on social media.

8. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He has been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is totally false and based on concocted facts. There is case and counter case between the parties. Earlier, the grandfather of the petitioner filed a case against the informant and other accused persons and thereafter, to save his skin in the alleged case, the informant lodged the present case against the petitioner. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

9. Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the victim is minor girl aged about 17 years and she has also supported the prosecution case in her



statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C, hence petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

10. Considering the facts and circumstances of case as well as age of the victim, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

11. However, if petitioner surrenders before the learned Court below within six weeks from today and seeks regular bail, the learned Court below shall pass order on the same day in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

