

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65367 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-255 Year-2025 Thana- DEEPNAGAR District- Nalanda

=====

Pappu Saw @ Pappu Kumar @ Dhodha S/o Om Saw R/o Village -
Mahanandpur, P.S - Deepnagar, District - Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. XYZ d/o- Gagan Sharma R/o Village - Mahanandpur, P.S - Deepnagar,
District - Nalanda

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sushen Kumar Keshri, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anuj Kumar Shrivastava, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Satya Prakash Sinha, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 208-10-2025
1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf
of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Deepnagar P.S. Case No. 255 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 64(1), 62 and 126(2) of the
BNS, 2023 read with Sections 8 and 12 of the POCSO Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his daughter, on 20.06.2025 at 03:00 PM, was going to attend nature's call when petitioner acted inappropriately with her and scratched her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that there were some grocery dues, which the informant was not paying and the petitioner was demanding, as such, the instant false case came to be instituted. It is next submitted that though in the anticipatory bail application, a plea has been taken that the case has been compromised and the compromise petition has been annexed by way of Annexure-2, but then it is submitted that inadvertently the said plea was taken, the case has not been compromised.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that no father would institute an FIR knowing that such allegation would bring disrepute to her daughter. The learned APP for the State submits that investigation in the case is in its nascent stages.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned



APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

