

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29541 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-7 Year-2025 Thana- MAHILA P.S District- West Champaran

Arvind Kumar Ram @ Arbind Kumar S/O Rampriti Ram @ Shampati Ram @
Sampati Ram R/O Village- Manguraha, P.S- Ramnagar, Distt.- West
Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. [REDACTED] R/O Village- Ramauli, Ward No. 5, P.S- Shikarpur,
Distt.- West Champaran.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Bimlesh Kumar Pandey
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Manoj Kumar, APP
	Mr. Prashant Kumar, Adv

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 3 06-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf
of the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Section 376 of the IPC.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody
since 16-2-2025 and is a young boy aged about 25 years and the
informant alleges that she came in contact with the petitioner in
the year 2021, when she had gone to her maternal uncle's place
and started talking, further on 1-3-2024 the petitioner took her
to his house at Narkatiyaganj, where no one was present, on the



pretext that he will get her form filled for appointment in Jharkhand Police and established physical relation and thereafter threatened not to disclose to any one. It is next alleged that thereafter petitioner used to talk her regularly on mobile and again established physical relation at Bettiah and videographed the same, next alleges that the petitioner again met on 9-5-2024 at his residence and established physical relation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the relationship was consensual. It is further submitted that whenever consensual relationship sours, allegation of establishing physical relations is alleged. It is next submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that if the informant was not willing to continue in the relationship, then why the informant kept on talking and meeting with the petitioner even after 1-3-2024. It is next submitted that had the petitioner established physical relations with the informant against her will, in that event, the informant would have approached the police instantly. It is further submitted that allegation of threatening and putting under fear is only to give serious colour



to the case. It is next submitted that had the informant been coerced into submission by putting her into fear, in that event the instant FIR would not have been instituted. It is also submitted that petitioner does not dispute that they were in a relationship, but then allegation of forcibly establishing physical relations is exaggerated. It is next submitted that charge-sheet has been submitted and charges have been framed.

5. The learned APP and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the bail application, but then they are not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner and the informant were in relationship for last more than four years and that it does not appear probable that petitioner had established physical relations against the consent of the informant and that whenever any consensual relationships sours, an FIR is instituted alleging that physical relations were established. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that since charges have been framed, as such if privilege of bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner will abscond on which the learned counsel appearing on the petitioner submits that the petitioner will not abscond, rather will cooperate in the trial to prove his innocence.



6. Considering the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above named be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Bettiah (Mahila) P.S. Case No. 07 of 2025.

7. However, it is made clear that if the learned trial court comes to a conclusion that the petitioner after his release is trying to delay the trial in any manner, the learned trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

