

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73702 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8 Year-2024 Thana- Araria Sangram District- Madhubani

Md. Gulab @ Zeyaul @ Ziyaul Islam Son of Md. Wasim Resident of Village -  
Gidarganj, P.S.- Andhrathadhi, District - Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Md. Sahjanha Son of Md. Sakir Marhoom Resident of Village - Sangram,  
P.S.- Arariya Sangram, District - Madhubani.

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                              |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Ravi Prakash, Adv.       |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP      |
| For the Informant    | : | Mr. Rajkumar Rajesh, Adv.    |
|                      | : | Mr. Jeet Kishore Mahto, Adv. |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      26-10-2024                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned  
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Arariya Sangram P.S. Case No. 08 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 376, 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 4 of the POCSO Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner enticed the informant's daughter by assuring her of marriage.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. He submits that



the occurrence took place on 10.07.2023 and F.I.R. was lodged on 03.04.2024 after lapse of about nine months of alleged occurrence and no any satisfactory explanation has been given regarding the delay for lodging the F.I.R. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of the this application.

5. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the statement of the victim was recorded under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. in which she has supported the prosecution case.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case and the statement of the victim under Section 164 of Cr.P.C., I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

**(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)**

anand/-

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

