

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59607 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-260 Year-2024 Thana- FORBESGANJ District- Araria

Vedanand Mandal son of Late Thegu Mandal Village - Kothihat, ward no -03,
P.S - Forbesganj, District - Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Vinay Kumar das son of Late Lakshmi Das village- kothihat chauk, Ps-
Forbesganj, Distt- Araria

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramesh Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Usha Kumari 1, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. B. PD. SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 25-02-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Forbesganj P.S. Case No. 260 of 2024 for the offence under Sections 354 B, 504 of the Indian Penal Code and sections 3 (i) (r) (s) (w) of Schedule Caste & Schedule Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act and Section 8 of POCSO Act.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant -Vinay Kumar Das has alleged that on 06.04..2024, petitioner – Vedanand Mandal called his 12 years old daughter to his house and tried to outrage her modesty. It is also alleged that the petitioner hurled caste based abuses over the informant and ousted him.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case on suspicion and previous enmity on account of land dispute and dirty village politics. He submits that without any occurrence as alleged by the informant, he lodged the present false case using name of her minor daughter as instrument and taking advantage of his caste to put pressure upon the petitioner. Further he submits that the petitioner belongs to a respected family of said locality and has good image and reputation in society and has never committed any wrong act, his name has been surfaced in the present false case only to put pressure upon him for the alleged land dispute. Lastly he prayed to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

5. Learned APP for the state has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioner.

6. From perusal of the case dairy, at para 2, 3 witnesses have supported the alleged occurrence. At para 31, statement of victim recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. has been annexed in which the age of victim has been assessed as 12 years. In her statement, she has supported the allegation levelled against the petitioner in the F.I.R. However, some independent witnesses have stated about previous land dispute between the



parties. Investigation is still going on in this case.

7. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and considering the statement of victim recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C., I am not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, anticipatory bail application of petitioner stands dismissed.

(S. B. Pd. Singh, J)

prabhakar/-

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

