

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60472 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-155 Year-2025 Thana- SHRIKRISHNAPURI District- Patna

Pallav Kumar S/o Sunil Kumar @ Sunil Kumar Singh R/o Ashiana Digha Road, Karpuri Sadan, 90 Ft. Road No. 5, Dev Vihar Colony, Rajeev Nagar Colony, P.S.- Rajeev Nagar, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Jagannath Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Nitya Nand Tiwary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 08-09-2025 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 74, 78, 352, 351(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of the B.N.S. and Section 67 of the I.T. Act.

3. As per prosecution case, informant, who is working in Bandhan Bank as Relationship Manager, alleged that on 19.06.2025 at about 6:55 PM, this petitioner, along with his associates, came to the Bank, abused the informant in filthy language, made obscene remarks and threatened her.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has



committed no offence. As a matter of fact, prior to lodging of the present case, the informant took Rs. 2,25,000/- from this petitioner and when he demanded his money, the informant refused to return the same and threatened him of implicating him in false and concocted case for which the petitioner filed an application before the S.S.P., Patna and lodged informatory petition before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patna vide Informatory Petition No. 794 of 2025 and thereafter, filed a complaint case vide Complaint Case No. 5330(c) of 2025 in which notices have already been issued to the informant and others and in retaliation and only with a view to save her skin from the aforesaid case, this false and concocted case has been lodged. Petitioner claims clean antecedents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and submitted that petitioner is named in the F.I.R. with specific accusation that he, along with other accused persons, misbehaved with the informant, abused her in filthy language and threatened her. From bare perusal of the F.I.R. it is apparent that prior to lodging of the present case, this petitioner earlier also committed the same offence for which several applications were made by the informant before the police and after



intervention of the police, the dispute was resolved and thereafter again the petitioner committed the same offence.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and specific and direct nature of accusation, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

