

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68367 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-48 Year-2020 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Rohtas

=====

Ankesh Kumar @ Ankesh Kumar Singh S/O Lal Mohar Singh R/O Vill-
Kauva Khonch, Ps-Dinara, Dist-Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anand Kumar Ojha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Aditya Narayan Singh.1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

4 06-02-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with
Mahila Rohtas P.S. Case No. 48 of 2020 instituted for the offence
under Sections 376, 354, 509, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, the informant who is
victim of this case alleged that while she was going to shop then
petitioner and his father stopped her in the way and took her to
their home and petitioner committed rape with her six times. She
further alleged that petitioner tied her neck with cloths and
threatened to kill. The father of the petitioner was caught hold her
hand and torned her blouse.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has
falsely been implicated in this case due to dirty village politics.



The victim is a married lady. The story of the F.I.R. not believable that the petitioner along with his father committed such type of offence. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent as stated in para-3 of the bail petition. Moreover, he is languishing in judicial custody since 16.02.2023.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that the petitioner is named in the FIR upon whom the informant/victim has made direct allegation for committing rape with her. The victim/informant has supported the prosecution case in her statement recorded u/s 164 of the Cr.P.C. in para 24 of the case diary. She has further stated that earlier to the alleged occurrence, the petitioner was in practice to tease her. It is further submitted that witnesses of this case 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.

7. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as soon as possible.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

lata/-

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

