

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.748 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-276 Year-2025 Thana- JAYNAGAR District- Madhubani

Sonu Chaudhary @ Sonu Kumar @ Amit Ranjan S/o- Purendru Chaudhary
Resident of village- Kamlabari Goth PS- Jaynagar, Dist- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Tushar Anand, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 27-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Rabindra Kumar, learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 76, 79, 308(1), 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS as well as Section 67(A) of the Information Technology Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that she was taking coaching at Rakesh Mathematics Coaching Centre where Rakesh used to act inappropriately with her and on objection used to assault her. It is next alleged that Kuldeep and petitioner are landlords of the Coaching Centre and they also used to act inappropriately with the informant. It is alleged that Kuldeep and petitioner asked the informant to make video of Rakesh so that they can extract Rs.20 lakhs from him



and also threatened that if she will refuse, she will be killed, under threat, the informant kept the mobile in the classroom with video recording on. Further, Rakesh who was in the class came and started acting inappropriately with her but then saw the mobile, thus, took the mobile and started fleeing but was caught by petitioner and Kuldeep who snatched the mobile from him and transferred the video in their mobile and handed over the mobile of the informant to her after deleting the video. Further, based on the video, Kuldeep and petitioner started forcing the informant to come and establish physical relation or else the video would be made viral but she fled to Nepal on 10.08.2025 and thereafter came to know that Kuldeep and petitioner made the video viral on the facebook and the viral photographs are part of the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that Kuldeep and petitioner threatened her to make inappropriate video with Rakesh with a view to extort money from him and when Rakesh realized that his inappropriate acts are being video recorded, hence, he started



fleeing with the mobile when he was caught by Kuldeep and petitioner and they transferred the inappropriate video in their mobile and deleted the video from the mobile of the informant and handed over the mobile of the informant to her after deleting the video in her mobile and thereafter were forcing her to establish physical relation and later she came to know that the inappropriate video has been made viral. It is fairly submitted that during the course of investigation, it transpired that the video was made viral not from the mobile of the petitioner.

5. Mr. Rabindra Kumar, learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that earlier Kuldeep Singh @ Kuldeep Kumar Singh had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No. 85021 of 2025 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 17.02.2026. Similarly, Rakesh Ranjan Kumar @ Rakesh Kumar Yadav had also approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No. 73837 of 2025 and the same also came to be rejected by an order dated 18.11.2025. It is further submitted that the informant who was a student used to go to coaching where she was threatened by Kuldeep and petitioner to make inappropriate video with Rakesh with an intent to extort money from Rakesh



who was earning as a teacher and under the threat the informant even obeyed them but later they started exploiting the informant threatening that the video would be made viral in the event she does not establish physical relation. It is, thus, submitted that it is not a case for anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Jaynagar P.S. Case No. 276 of 2025 pending in the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Madhubani/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

