

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23719 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-44 Year-2025 Thana- RANIYATALAB District- Patna

=====

Pramod Kumar @ Golu Kumar S/O Umesh Yadav Resident of Village-
Lahladpur, Police station- Bikram, District- Patna. at present residing at
Village- Andharipur Mathiya, Police station- Ranitalab, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Gopal Jee S/O Late Ajay Yadav Residing at Village- Andhari Mathiya,
Police station- Ranitalab, District- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ravi Shanker Pankaj, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Chandra Mohan Jha, Advocate

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 29-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State. Perused
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Ranitalab P.S. Case No. 44 of 2025 corresponding to Special
Case (POCSO) No. 44 of 2025 instituted for the offences under
Sections 8/12 of the POCSO Act and Section 66E of the I.T.
Act.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner and
the co-accused made viral objectionable photographs of the
informant's minor sister, and later, the co-accused allegedly



caught hold of the minor girl while she was going to attend nature's call.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submitted that nothing has been whispered against the petitioner in Section 183 of the BNSS statement of the victim. Learned counsel further submitted that victim girl has even refused to undergo medical examination. Learned counsel further submitted that the attempt to outraging the modesty and making photographs of the victim viral is not attributed to the petitioner. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 31.01.2025 and has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, there being no material against the petitioner in Section 183 BNSS statement of the victim as also the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Let the petitioner be released on bail on furnishing



bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below/concerned Court in connection with Ranitalab P.S. Case No. 44 of 2025.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

