

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69479 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-362 Year-2019 Thana- RAJIVNAGAR District- Patna

1. MUKESH KUMAR SINGH @ MUKESH SINGH, aged about 53 years, Gender Male, S/O BHAIKAV PRASAD SINGH R/O VILL.- MILKI, P.S-GANGTAMORE, DIST.- MUNGER, presently residing at Semariya, P.S-Jasidih, Dist- Deoghar (Jharkhand)
2. MANITA SINGH, aged about 50 years, Gender – Female, wife of MUKESH KUMAR SINGH @ MUKESH SINGH R/O VILL.- MILKI, P.S-GANGTAMORE, DIST.- MUNGER, presently residing at Semariya, P.S-Jasidih, Dist- Deoghar (Jharkhand)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pratik Mishra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 30-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 376, 313 of the I.P.C.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are person with clean antecedents and have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant being parents of Vinit Sing *alias* Jayvardhan Singh. It is next submitted that informant alleges that she met Vinit Singh in the year 2015 while she was engaged in a private job and Vinit



Singh being aware that informant is a divorcee and has a child aged about 6 years promised her to marry and on false promise of marriage, established physical relationship. The learned counsel for the petitioners next submits that the FIR was instituted in the year 2019 and the relationship in between the informant and Vinit Singh was continuing from 2015 as such it does not appear probable that informant who was a divorcee was not able to gaze the intention of Vinit that he will not marry her. It is next submitted that no doubt Vinit was in relationship with the informant but then there was no promise of marriage as informant was aged about more than 25 years with a child and Vinit was 19 years of age in the year 2015.

4. It is further submitted that after the FIR came to be instituted in the year 2019, the Investigating Officer of the case who was entrusted with the investigation was suspended as such the investigation did not proceed and it was only on 18.06.2023 that the case was handed over to another investigating officer for investigating the case. It is also submitted that petitioners were completely unaware that the informant has instituted the instant FIR. It is also submitted that petitioners have been implicated in the case, in order to coerce Vinit into submission. It is further submitted that the statement of the victim was also



recorded under Section 164 of the CrPC wherein she has not alleged that it were these petitioners who demanded Rs. 5 lakhs, and got her pregnancy aborted as has been specifically pleaded in Para 25 of the anticipatory bail application. It is also submitted that petitioner No. 1 is a government servant and has been posted with the Electricity Department at Deoghar and petitioner No. 2 is house wife.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Rajivnagar P.S. Case No. 362 of 2019 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

GAURAV S./-

U			
---	--	--	--

