

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.62105 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-83 Year-2022 Thana- DANAPUR District- Patna

Ranu Kumar, Son Of Shri Sanjay Kumar R/O Village- Gauri Chak, P.S.-
Bihta, P.O.- Neura, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dinu Kumar- Sr. Advocate Ms. Ritika Rani- Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Sharda Kumari- A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 20-06-2023 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 67/67(A) of the I. T. Act in connection with Danapur P. S. Case No.83 of 2022.

3. The Court feels perturbed and disturbed by the conduct of the petitioner in the nature of allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. The informant is a married lady, but prior to marriage, she was in love with this petitioner. The love was childhood's love as such, she completely trusted



him and in time of weakness, it appears that she shared some very personal photographs to the petitioner, which was subsequently made made viral when she was married. It appears that the petitioner with whom the informant was in love after receiving the personal photographs of the informant shared the same with his friend Ankit Kumar and the same was subsequently made viral, which completely shattered the informant as a person.

4. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is next submitted that the picture of the informant was made viral by Ankit Kumar and not by this petitioner. It is next submitted that it has also not come during the course of investigation that it was this petitioner from whose mobile the picture was made viral or he had shared the same with Ankit Kumar. It is next submitted that father of Ankit Kumar has also instituted Danapur P. S. Case No. 409 of 2022 against the informant and her husband Arpit Raj alleging that Arpit Raj made a call on the mobile of his friend Jai Shankar seeking extortion for compromising



the case. It is further submitted that Ankit Kumar is in custody.

5. Learned Additional P.P. vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that the informant is a woman and after her objectionable picture, which she had shared with the petitioner was made viral, she instituted the present case alleging that she had shared the said picture with the petitioner as prior to her marriage, she was in love. It is next submitted that the informant shared the picture with the petitioner as she completely trusted him, but if for some reason, the marriage of the informant with the petitioner did not materialize, the same led to making viral of her objectionable picture by Ankit Kumar which was shared to him by this petitioner.

6. The learned A.P.P. next submits that the trust of the informant in the petitioner was breached completely. It is further submitted that the case instituted by the father of Ankit Kumar against the informant and her husband is nothing, but a ploy to create pressure. It is also submitted that if what has been alleged in the F.I.R. is true, then



definitely the mobile number from which Jai Shankar received extortion call must also have been disclosed. This further cast an aspersion on the conduct of the father of Ankit Kumar.

7. In the nature of allegation and after taking into consideration the submission of the learned Additional P. P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

