

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47600 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-154 Year-2024 Thana- BARGAINIA District- Sitamarhi

Md. Nooren Mansoori @ Nooren Alam S/O Md. Mehrul Mansoori R/O
Village- Ward No.1 Dhuniya Tola, Nandwara, P.S- Bairgania, Distt.-
Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. XXX W/O [REDACTED] R/O Village- Shivanagar Tola,
Chamda Godam, Ward No. 15, P.S- Bairgania, Distt.- Sitamarhi.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ayush Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Chandra Sen Prasad Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 30-07-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Bairgania P.S. Case No. 154 of 2024 registered for the
offences punishable under Section 376 of the Indian Penal
Code read with Sections 6 and 8 of the POCSO Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that petitioner forcefully made physical relation with
the minor daughter of the informant on the pretext of



marriage, thereafter, he took her to Nepal and got married in a *Masjid* and again established physical relationship.

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 F.I.R., it would manifest that informant himself alleges that petitioner married the daughter of the informant. It is also submitted that petitioner being husband is aware of his responsibility towards the daughter of the informant, but then he has been falsely implicated in the instant case when petitioner and the victim were in love.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the victim is aged about 14 years. It is also submitted that there is no denial in the anticipatory bail application with regard to the age of the victim. It is next submitted that even if the petitioner married the victim with her consent, in that event consent of a minor has no meaning.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

