

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5656 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2753 Year-2004 Thana- SARAN COMPLAINT CASE District-
Saran

=====

Satyendra Kumar @ Satendra Kumar Son Of Late Ram Balak Paswan
Resident Of Village - Raja Bazar Daulatpur South, P.S. - Jehanabad, District -
Jehanabad. The Then Sho, Masrakh Police Station, Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Nirmala Devi Wife Of Ram Janam Singh Resident Of Village - Masrakh,
P.O. And P.S. - Masrakh, District - Saran

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vijay Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Anurag Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 17-02-2024 Heard both parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Complaint
Case No. 2753 of 2004 corresponding to Sessions Trial No. 284
of 2022, registered for the offences punishable under Sections
323, 342, 376 and 511 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 12.11.2004 at 12
'O' Clock of noon, this petitioner called the complainant and
thereafter, under the influence of alcohol established physical
relation with her.

4. It is submitted by the counsel for petitioner that
petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this
case. Petitioner is a government employee and claims clean
antecedent.

5. There is allegation against this petitioner that he



sexually assaulted the complainant on 12.11.2004 at about 12 ‘O’ clock of noon. Complainant has supported allegation against accused petitioner in her solemn affirmation. Inquiry witnesses nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 have also supported allegation against accused petitioner. Summoning order against accused petitioner has been passed by the court below on 08.05.2007, but the petitioner did not appear after cognizance and the case was committed to the learned court of Sessions on 23.11.2020, but petitioner remained absent through out for the last 20 years.

6. Considering the accusation and the fact that petitioner has moved before this court for anticipatory bail after lapse of twenty years, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above-named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

vinita/-

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

