

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6270 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-70 Year-2024 Thana- KACCHWA District- Rohtas

Chitranjan Yadav @ Manjan S/O Binod Yadav R/O Vill.- Saraiya, P.S.-
Kachhawan, Dist.- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Reetu Kumari S/O Manoj Ram R/O Vill.- Saraiya, P.S.- Kachhawan, Dist.-
Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Advocate Ms. Malti Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Sadanand Paswan, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4 16-05-2025 Heard learned Senior counsel for the petitioner,

learned APP for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Kachhawan P.S. Case No. 70 of 2024, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 354(D), 376, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, read with Section 4, 12 of the POCSO Act, Sections 3(1)(r)(w)(i) and 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, the petitioner along with other co-accused persons used to threaten the victim on the way to her school and forcibly made physical relations with her three times by giving various types of threat on phone.



4. Learned Senior 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 Senior counsel for the petitioner also submits that there is delay of two months in lodging the FIR. The false case has been lodged against the petitioner due to land dispute between informant's family and uncle of the petitioner. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. It is next submitted that nothing has been transpired in the medical report. The petitioner is in custody since 30.07.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner of committing rape upon the minor victim girl. Statement of the victim recorded under Section 161 of Cr.P.C. and Section 164 of Cr.P.C. also supports the case of prosecution. 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 at this stage.



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

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

