

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19281 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-498 Year-2018 Thana- GAYA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Gaya

=====

Siyaram Singh Son of Late Ramdhir Singh Resident of Village - Saundra, P.S.
- Gehlour, District - Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Maro Devi W/O- Shankar Rawani, R/O Vill-Sondra, p.s- Gehlaur, Dist-
Gaya

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anurag Saurav, Advocate Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Advocate Mr. Ankesh Bibhu, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Uday Pratap Singh, APP
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Brajesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

8 24-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and learned counsel for the complainant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Complaint Case No. 498 of 2018, instituted for the offences
punishable under Sections 354, 376, 511, 34 of the Indian Penal
Code, Sections 3/4 of the POCSO Act.

3. Earlier, anticipatory bail of the petitioner was
rejected by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated
19.10.2023 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 58218 of 2023.

4. The prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner
with an intention to commit rape of complainant's daughter,



entered into the house of complainant and tried to outrage the modesty of the complainant's daughter and on *hulla* the petitioner anyhow managed to escape.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the complaint. The only allegation levelled against the petitioner is of disrobing the victim and not doing any overt act with her. Learned counsel for the petitioner has filed supplementary affidavit with regard to the present stage of the case and it is submitted that only three witnesses have been examined in this case and the victim is yet to be examined. The petitioner is in custody since 09.09.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.

6. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and taking into account the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Let the petitioner be released on bail on furnishing



bail bonds of Rs. 15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below/concerned Court in connection with Complaint Case No. 498 of 2018, subject to the following conditions:

(I) One of the bailors shall be own/close member of the family of the petitioner.

(II) The petitioner shall appear on each and every date fixed at the trial. In case of default in such appearance on two consecutive dates, the Trial Court will have liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

