

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47458 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-81 Year-2023 Thana- KOCHADHAMAN District- Kishanganj

Raman Kumar @ Raman Kumar Singh Son of Sahdev Prasad Singh Resident  
of Village - Phulwari, PS- Kochadhaman, Dist- Kishanganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raj Kumar, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajit Kumar, APP.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

2      07-08-2024                      Heard Mr. Raj Kumar, learned counsel appearing on  
behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Ajit Kumar, learned APP for the  
State.

2. The petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in connection  
with Kochadhaman P.S. Case No. 81 of 2023 registered for the  
offence punishable under Sections 313, 314, 302 and 120 (B) of  
the Indian Penal Code.

3. Allegation is of administering medicine for aborting  
7 months old foetus which the daughter of the informant has  
conceived in course of relationship with the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the  
petitioner submitted that from perusal of the F.I.R., it appears  
that the victim has admitted that she was in relationship with the



petitioner and the specific allegation of forceful termination of foetus is against the family members of the petitioner and not against the petitioner. The petitioner having clean antecedent seeks to be released on bail.

5. Learned APP referring to the allegation made in the F.I.R. and information contained therein submits that the victim has informed the informant who is her father that the father and uncle of the petitioner has forcefully administered medicine for terminating pregnancy, however, complicity of the petitioner cannot be ruled out in commission of the offence.

6. Having considered the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties, as well as, the fact that there is no direct allegation in the F.I.R. that it is the petitioner who had administered medicine for terminating pregnancy, however, in the F.I.R., it is admitted by the parties that the petitioner and the victim were in relationship and there was a panchayati for the purpose of settlement, I find that the complicity of the petitioner cannot be denied in commission of the offence. I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on pre-arrest bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

7. However, the petitioner, if so advised, may surrender before the District Court and seek regular bail. The



District Court in the facts and circumstances of the case may  
pass reasoned order on the basis of material on the same day.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

mantreshwar/-

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

