

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80669 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-58 Year-2024 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Siwan

Rajeev Kumar Singh @ Rajeev Kumar S/o Satyanarayan Singh R/o Village-
Upharaul Chowk Desari Hanuman mandir, P.S.- Desari, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vasant Vikas, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar No.1, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 09-12-2024 Heard Mr. Vasant Vikas, learned counsel for the petitioner
and Mr. Dilip Kumar No.1, learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Siwan Mahila P.S. Case No. 58 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 376, 387, 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Allegedly, petitioner is said to have established physical relations with the informant forcefully on the pretext of marriage, but later on he went back on his word and solemnized marriage with other woman. It is further alleged that the petitioner also demanded Rs. 5 lacs from the informant with a threat to make her vulgar photographs viral on social media.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no



offence. No such occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. He has falsely been implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is totally false and based on concocted facts. The real fact of the matter is that the petitioner is an employee of Tarasa Services Pvt. Ltd. and when the demand of loan made by the informant and her mother was denied by the petitioner, this false case has been filed against him. It is further submitted that there is inordinate and abnormal delay of more than three years in lodging the FIR without assigning any plausible and convincing reason for the said delay, which creates serious doubt about the prosecution case. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the statement of the victim has been recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. in which she has supported the prosecution case. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the statement of the victim recorded under Section 164 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.

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

