

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72076 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-14 Year-2024 Thana- Mau District- Gaya

Ravi Kumar @ Sonu Kumar Son of Kapil Yadav Resident of Village-
Chhakkan Bigha, PS- Mau, Distt.- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Choubey Jawahar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 21-11-2024 Heard Mr. Pramod Kumar, learned counsel for the
petitioner, Mr. Choubey Jawahar, learned APP for the State and
perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Mau
P.S. Case No. 14 of 2024, instituted for the offences punishable
under Sections 323, 379 and 376(D) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, the petitioner
along with other co-accused persons in the name of offering job
committed rape upon the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the
present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case.
Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the
petitioner is not named in the FIR. Name of the petitioner has
transpired on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused



Ranjan Kumar and the same has got no evidentiary value. It is further submitted that the co-accused Ranjan Kumar has been granted default bail by the Court below. There is no specific allegation attributed against the petitioner, rather the allegation levelled against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. The petitioner is in custody since 11.05.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is also submitted that though the petitioner is not named in the FIR but his name has surfaced on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Ranjan Kumar. As per CDR contents and evidence gather during investigation, the involvement of this petitioner was found with other two accused. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial expeditiously.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

