

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20821 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-35 Year-2023 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Madhepura

=====

Sujeet Kumar S/o Madan Sharma R/o Vill - Rampuriya Basa, P.S. - Alam  
Nagar, Dist. - Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1. The State of Bihar
- 2. Madhu Devi W/o Kuldip Sharma R/o Village - Purvi Kherho, Ward No. 16,  
P.S. - Puraini, Dist. - Madhepura

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                            |                             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s :     | Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, Adv. |
| For the Opposite Party/s : | Mr. Md. Shakir Ahmad, APP   |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR  
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

5      13-08-2024                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, informant and  
  
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in a case instituted  
  
for the offence under Sections 341, 323, 354, 376, 504, 511/34 of  
  
the Indian Penal Code, Sections 3/4 of the POCSO Act and Section  
  
67B of the I.T. Act.

3. As per prosecution case, the informant alleged that  
  
her minor daughter was playing in front of the house but did not  
  
return after some time. It is further alleged that the informant came  
  
to know that one Kalpana Devi took her daughter in her house,  
  
thereafter the informant went there and saw that the petitioner was  
  
trying to commit wrong with the informant’s daughter and made  
  
her videos viral.



4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He has committed no offence. The petitioner and the brother of the informant is full brother-in-law (*sadhu*). There has been delay in lodging the present FIR. Petitioner is a person of clean antecedent and he is in custody since 02.11.2023.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant have opposed the application for bail and submitted that petitioner is named in the FIR. They submitted that the victim is a minor girl and her statement has been recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. in which she specifically stated that this petitioner undressed her and tried to commit wrong. She further stated that the petitioner made her naked videos, which corroborates the prosecution case. During investigation several witnesses have also supported the prosecution case.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands **rejected**.

**(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)**

Arish/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

