

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50949 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-224 Year-2023 Thana- LAUKAHA District- Madhubani

Anil Kumar Yadav @ Anil Kumar Son of Rameshwar Yadav Resident of
village - Rampur, P.S.- Laukaha, District - Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. X Daughter of Sanjay Yadav Resident of village - Arnama, P.S.- Laukaha,
District - Madhubani

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Gagandeo Yadav, Adv. Mr. Ravi Prakash
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Damodar Prasad Tiwary, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Jitendra Kumar Bharti, Adv.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

4 14-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

APP for the State as also learned counsel for the Informant.

Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner has earlier moved before this Court

with a prayer for anticipatory bail which was dismissed by a

Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 22.02.2024

passed in Cr. Misc. No. 10533 of 2024.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with

Laukaha P.S. Case No. 224 of 2023 instituted for the

offences under Sections 420, 376, 341, 323, 504, 34 of the



Indian Penal Code and Section 4/6 of the POCSO Act.

4. Allegedly, the petitioner is said to have established illicit physical relationship with the informant/victim on the pretext of marriage and when she got pregnant, the informant's mother informed the petitioner's family and suggested for the marriage of victim and the petitioner, upon which they asked for terminating the pregnancy and, on protest, they threatened to kill the victim and her mother.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case due to ulterior motive. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has not committed any offence. No such occurrence in the manner as alleged has ever taken place. The medical report of the victim shows her age around 17 to 18 years. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the victim on her own will established physical relation with the petitioner. The victim girl in her statement recorded under Section 164



of the Cr.P.C. has stated that she wants to marry with the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the matter has been compromised between the parties and good relation has been restored. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and is languishing in judicial custody since 13.03.2025 without any rhymes or reason.

6. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged is serious in nature. The victim girl in her statement recorded under Sections 161 and 164 of the Cr.P.C. has supported the prosecution case. The victim girl is minor. In the medical report, it has been stated that the urine pregnancy test is positive and, thus, supports the prosecution case. The Investigating Officer, after completion of investigation, has submitted charge-sheet against the petitioner for offence under Sections 420, 376, 341, 323, 504, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 4/6 of the POCSO Act. The cognizance has also been taken by the learned court below. Learned counsel for the Informant submits that the case has been compromised between the



parties.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and considering the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

