

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80559 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-200 Year-2025 Thana- NARHATT District- Nawada

=====

Ankit Kumar @ Sitan Son of Late Ajay Kumar Chaudhary Resident of
Village- Pandey Bigha, Post- Akari, PS -Narhat, Dist- Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Verma, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satya Nand Shukla, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 11-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Narhat P.S. Case No. 200 of 2025 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 78(i)(ii), 87 and 351(2) of the 2023.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that marriage of his niece was fixed with Mansoor, but
petitioner from his mobile sent obscene picture of his niece on
mobile of Mansoor and said that he will marry the victim, on
account of which the marriage got cancelled, further on
15.06.2025, petitioner enticed and was taking the victim to an
unknown place but was given a chase hence left her and fled.
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 the date of occurrence is 15.06.2025 and the FIR came to be instituted on 18.06.2025 i.e. after a delay of three days without any plausible explanation of delay which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it manifests that petitioner and the victim were known to each other and when the marriage of the victim got fixed with Mansoor, the petitioner sent her obscene pictures on the mobile of Mansoor leading to cancellation of marriage. It is also submitted that the said specific allegation is not rebutted by the petitioner in his anticipatory bail application, as such, it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, 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	
---	--	---	--

