

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80060 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-18 Year-2024 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Banka

Javed Ansari, Son of Md. Saeed Ansari, Resident of Village- Jaipur
Ramandih, PS- Dhorayia, Dist.- Banka, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Noojahat Praveen, W/o Javed Ansari, Anganwari Sevika, Ward no.2,
Village-Jaipur, P.O and P.S -Dhorayia, District-Banka, Bihar, PIN Code-
813113

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Saroj Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anuj Kumar Shrivastava, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

5 29-01-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel
for the informant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with
Banka Mahila P.S. Case No.18 of 2024 instituted for the offence
under Sections 65(2), 351(3) of the B.N.S. and Sections 4/6 of the
POCSO Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner who
is the father of four daughters committed rape with his two
daughters.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner
has submitted that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the
present case. There is delay in filing of the F.I.R. It has further
been submitted that medical report does not support the version of



prosecution. A statement has been made in para-3 of the petition that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. He is languishing in judicial custody since 18.08.2024.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state and learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer of regular bail. Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that as the offence was committed by father, he took time to muster courage to file case against him. It is further submitted that during course of investigation, both the victims have given their statements under Sections 161 and 164 of the Cr.P.C. They have supported the case of the prosecution and they have stated that they were being subjected to rape by their father.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and nature of allegation is very heinous, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. Petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after six months, if so advised.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

lata/-

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

