

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.83172 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-321 Year-2023 Thana- DIDARGANJ District- Patna

=====

DHARMJEET SINGH @ CHOTE MASTER @ DHARMJEET KUMAR
SINGH S/O-Ravindra Singh R/o Village-Kon Kothiya,P.O. Rukunpur,(under
gram panchayat Fatehpur), P.S. Didargang, District-Patna (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amit Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kalyan Shankar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 19-03-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Didarganj P.S. Case No.321 of 2023 lodged under Sections 376,
504, 506 and 34 of the I.P.C. read with section 66(E) of the I.T.
Act. and read with section 4 of the POCSO Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the F.I.R. has been
lodged against three named accused persons including the
petitioner against whom there is specific allegation against the
petitioner of developing physical relation with the informant by
black mailing her and subsequently, make the video viral.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He submits



that from the content of the F.I.R., it is clear that the said occurrence has caused 4 years back, but on no early occasion, F.I.R. has been lodged.

5. Counsel further submits that the petitioner is a reputed person of society and a disabled person of 70 per cent and such type of allegation may not be accepted.

6. Counsel further submits that both the informant and petitioner are resident of same village and due to local village politics, the name of the petitioner has been figured in this case with a view to teach him a lesson.

7. Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 24.09.2023 having clean antecedent.

8. Learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that in the F.I.R., it has categorical allegation against the present petitioner that he has developed physical relation with the minor girl since last 4 years under threat to make the video viral.

9. Counsel further submits that as per the matriculation certificate, her age is less than 18 years and medical has been taken later on, therefore, the age ascertained by the doctor may not be taken into consideration.

10. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer



for bail and submits that the case diary and statement under section 164 of Cr.P.C have been called for.

11. Upon perusal of the statement of the victim, it is crystal clear to this Court that whatever alleged in the F.I.R. has been fully supported by the informant.

12. In the present facts and circumstances of this case and the submissions made above, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Prakashmani/-

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

