

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76031 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-34 Year-2024 Thana- MAHNAR District- Vaishali

=====

Rahul Kumar Son of Dharamdeo Rai Resident of Village -Murowatpur Police  
Station -Desari, Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                               |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Ranjeet Kumar, Advocate   |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam, APP |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      18-01-2025                      Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and  
Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Mahnar P.S. Case No.34 of 2024, lodged on 14.02.2024, under Sections 304/313/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against three named accused persons including the present petitioner against whom there is allegation made by the In-Charge Medical Officer that they used to do the abortion work in connivance with other co-accused persons in result one Juli Devi died.



4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He submits that the entire allegation is baseless. Counsel submits that the antecedent of the petitioner is clean. Counsel submits that he has no concerned with co-accused Punam Devi or her alleged practice. He is not involved in any illegal practice rather he is working private job in Punjab.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that case has been filed by the In-charge Medical Officer of Community Health Centre, Mahnar, with specific allegation against the accused persons including the present petitioner that they involved in illegal abortion work.

6. It transpires to this Court that pleading has been taken by the Counsel for the petitioner that he is doing private job in Punjab but he has not produced any document in this regard.

7. As such, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is refused. However, in case the petitioner surrenders within four weeks from today before the Trial Court and provides the proof of job certificate that he is



working in Punjab, his prayer for regular bail shall be considered without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

