

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29188 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-70 Year-2024 Thana- TELMAR District- Nalanda

Pintu Kumar S/o Jitendra Singh @ Sukhari Singh Village- Laludih, Police Station- Telmar, District- Nalanda Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Pooja Devi W/O Ranjit Singh Village- Laludih, Police Station- Telmar, District- Nalanda Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shantanu Kumar

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 O.P. No.2.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with POCSO Case No.155/2024, arising out of Telmar P.S. Case No.70/2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 74, 352, 351(2) of the B.N.S. and Sections 8/12 of the POCSO Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a young boy aged about 23 years and is in custody since 31.01.2025. It is next submitted that informant alleges that petitioner acted inappropriately with her minor daughter.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that 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 informant alleges that his minor daughter had gone to pluck flower, when petitioner with ill intention caught her and tried to take her away but then the victim somehow managed to escape from his clutches. It is next submitted that it does not appear probable that had the petitioner harboring any ill intention, in that event, the victim would have escaped from his clutches. It is submitted that petitioner and the victim were known to each other and they were talking when the informant saw, the present false case came to be instituted. It is also submitted that charges have been framed, trial has commenced and three witnesses have been examined but then it is asserted and submitted that petitioner is a young boy and is in judicial custody for nearly six months and in the event if his incarceration is prolonged, in that event, chances are bright that he may come in contact with hardened criminals. It is further submitted that even the allegation as alleged in the FIR does not inspire confidence.

5. Learned A.P.P. and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner but then are not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that



out of six prosecution witnesses, only three prosecution witnesses have been examined but then it is submitted that if the petitioner is granted the privilege of bail, the petitioner may abscond, on which, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner will not abscond rather will co-operate in the trial to prove his innocence.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.25000/- (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 POCSO Case No.155/2024.

7. Further, one of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his father, namely, Jitendra Singh @ Sukhari Singh.

8. It is made clear that if the learned trial court comes to a conclusion that 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)

amit/-

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

