

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47261 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-85 Year-2024 Thana- PRANPUR District- Katihar

=====

Saurav Kumar Singh @ Saurav Singh S/o Rama Kant Singh R/o Village-
Satrampur, P.S.- Pranpur, District- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Aachalkumari D/o Dilip Kumar Sharma R/o Village- Tikeli, P.S.- Dankhora,
District- Katihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Kumar Yadav, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Singh, A.P.P

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

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

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection
with Pranpur P.S. Case No. 85 of 2024 lodged on 01.06.2024,
for the offence punishable under Sections 366 & 370 of the
Indian Penal Code, pending in the Court of Additional Sessions
Judge 2nd, Katihar.

3. As per the prosecution, case has been lodged by
virtue of the compliant filed by the victim lady. The FIR has
been lodged against three named accused persons including the
present petitioner. It has been alleged in the FIR that the present



petitioner has purchased the informant for the purpose of marriage and after that he took the informant to Amritsar and misbehaved with her and also committed rape with her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Counsel submits that the informant herself did not want to live with her husband and under deep rooted conspiracy, she has filed a criminal case against her husband and two other persons. Actually, it is the father of the informant who is the real culprit in this case. Counsel further submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the allegation is in two parts. First part is prior to marriage and second is after marriage. Counsel submits that the role of the husband starts after marriage which is torturous for the wife (informant) as alleged in the said compliant which was converted into FIR. Counsel further submits that the Sessions Judge has acknowledged in the rejection order that the statement of victim under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C was recorded in which she has supported the case of prosecution and stated that the accused-petitioner has forcibly make physical relation with her.



6. As such, in the present facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

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

