

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.56268 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-159 Year-2025 Thana- MANER District- Patna

Rohit Kumar son of Santosh Kumar @ Santosh Rai Aged 22 years Resident
of Village- Ratantola, Ps- Maner, Dist -Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Kanti Devi Wife of Durga Prasad Singh Resident Of Village- Ratantola, Ps-
Maner, Dist -Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shashank Shekhar, Adv Mr. Sangeeta Kumari Singh, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Nityanand Mishra, Adv Mr. Ajit Kumar, Adv Mr. Anish Chandra-2, Adv

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND
MALVIYA**

ORAL ORDER

3 17-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is in custody in connection with
Special POCSO Case No. 82 of 2025 arising out of Maner P.S.
Case No. 159 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 126(2)/308(2)/77/78/79 of the BNS and Section
66(E) of the IT Act and Section 8/12 of the POCSO Act.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, petitioner had allured
the daughter of the informant and took some objectionable
photographs of her and uploaded it on social media.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He next submits that the victim girl wants to marry the petitioner but when he refused, the victim girl had lodged the false case to pressurize the petitioner and his family members. He further submits that petitioner has never taken any objectionable photographs of the victim nor he uploaded any photo of the victim on social media platform. Moreover, police has also seized the mobile phone of the petitioner but police have not found any objectionable photo or video of the victim. It is also submitted that petitioner is in judicial custody since 05.03.2025 having two antecedent which has been filed by the family members of the victim girl of the present case.

5. However, learned APP for the State oppose the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner.

6. On perusal of the FIR, Statement under Section 183 of the BNSS and impugned order dated 27.06.2025, it appears that victim girl is minor and she has narrated in her statement under Section 183 of the BNSS that her objectionable photographs was taken by the mother of the petitioner and she has given to her son i.e., the present petitioner and he started to blackmail the victim girl and started demanding money and to save her dignity, victim girl used to give money to the petitioner.



So, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and submissions made on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the regular bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

7. However, the petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after one year in custody as per the provision laid down under the POCSO Act.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

