

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19747 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-609 Year-2023 Thana- MASAUDHI District- Patna

Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranjit Kumar S/O- Suresh Ray R/O- Malahi Khandha,
P.S.- Naubatpur, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Pramod Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Kalyan Shankar, APP
For the Informant	:	Ms. Vandana Kumari, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

6 18-12-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Special
Case (POCSO) No. 233 of 2023 arising out of Masaurhi P.S.
Case No. 609 of 2023 instituted for the offence under Section
376 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 4 & 8 of the POCSO
Act.

3. Prosecution case in a nutshell is that six years old
daughter of the informant went missing and during course of
search, she got a call from police station that one girl is found
and she is in police station. Later on, the girl discloses to her
mother that one old age person has done bad work with her and
she can identify him.



4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 16-09-2023. Petitioner bears no criminal antecedent, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioner is not named in the FIR. Name of the petitioner transpired in this case during course of investigation that too on the basis of suspicion. Charge sheet has been submitted in this case. It is next submitted that during course of investigation, victim identified the petitioner in T.I. Parade. Age of the petitioner is 35 years as per his Aadhaar Card, which shows that petitioner is not an old person, which is alleged in the FIR. There is no eye witness to the occurrence.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Referring to paragraph No. 57 of the case diary, it is submitted that petitioner was seen in the CCTV footage going with the victim. Victim has supported the allegation in her statement recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. as also she has identified the petitioner in T.I. Parade, which fact finds mention at paragraph No.143 of the case diary. Petitioner has confessed his guilt in his



confessional statement.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and taking into account the nature and gravity of the offence as also the materials against the petitioner in the case diary, this Court, at this stage, is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for grant of bail is accordingly *rejected*.

8. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

