

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31629 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-78 Year-2023 Thana- GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL COMP.
District- Bhojpur

Niraj Kumar Singh S/o Om Prakash Singh R/o Village- Patarihan, Ward No 3,
Nawada, PS- Sahar, Distt.- Bhojpur Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Braj Kishore Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Yogendra Kumar

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

4 11-12-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 78(o) of 2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 23 of pre conception and pre Natal Diagnostic Techniques Act, 1994.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that as per the complaint filed by the Civil Surgeon, Bhojpur, a district-level inspection drive was conducted from 20.05.2023 to 21.05.2023 under the orders of the District Magistrate and Superintendent of Police. During inspection of Vishnu Ultrasound and Maa Ultrasound at Mopati Bazar, Tarari, the operators allegedly failed to produce any required documents and the centres were sealed. In the inspection report, it was detected that the operators, Rakesh Kumar and Neeraj Kumar (petitioner) violated the provisions of the PC & PNDT Act, 1994.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He has further submitted that at the time of the inspection, the shop was closed and no incriminating article whatsoever was



recovered by the inspection team. The ultrasound machine was not physically examined, nor was the shop opened or inspected in presence of the petitioner. The petitioner is a person of clean antecedent.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail.

6. From perusal of the inquiry report of the Block Development Officer, Tarari, Bhojpur, which is annexed with the complaint petition, it appears that the petitioner was allegedly running an ultrasound centre in the name and style as “Maa Ultrasound’ in an illegal manner. The report clearly indicates that the petitioner failed to produce any document as required under the provisions for running an ultrasound centre.

7. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, it is *rejected*.

8. The petitioner is directed to surrender in the court below and seek regular bail. If the petitioner does so, the same shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/-

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

