

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.58 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-148 Year-2025 Thana- NAUTAN District- Siwan

Lakshman Thakur @ Lachhuman Thakur S/O Kailash Thakur R/O- Sahpur,
P.O- Misrauli, P.S.- Nautan, Dist.- Siwan, Bihar.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Nikki Kumari D/O Dayashankar Gond R/O Sahpur, P.O- Misrauli, P.S-
Nautan, Distt.- Siwan, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Ms. Misha Bharti, Advocate Mr. Vishal Vikram Rana, Advocate Mr. Utkarsh Vikram Rana, Advocate Mr. Kumar Saurav Dev, Advocate Mr. Akash Priye, Advocate Mr. Rishabh Kumar Rao, Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Usha Kumari 1, SPP
For the Resp. no.2	:	Mr. Sandeep Gupta, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

3 17-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned

Special Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for

the respondent no.2.

2. The instant appeal has been preferred against the

order dated 2.12.2025 whereby the prayer for grant of

anticipatory bail of the appellant in connection with Nautan P.S

Case no.148 of 2025 registered under sections 126(2), 115(2), 64,

123, 303(2), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya

Sanhita, 2023 and sections 3(1)(s), 3(1)(r), 3(1)(w) and 3(2)(va)

of the SC and ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 was



rejected by the learned trial Court.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that the appellant forcibly took her to his house where four other accused persons named in the FIR were present. She was abused in the name of her caste, given an intoxicated drink and thereafter taken to Delhi where the accused persons forcibly established physical relations with her.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has been falsely implicated in the case. The appellant and the respondent no.2 were in a relationship since long and the respondent no.2 has already taken jewellery and cash from him. There is no medical evidence in support of the allegations and telephonic conversations between the appellant and respondent no.2 has transpired in course of investigation. There is contradiction in the statement of the respondent no.2 as made in the FIR and her statement recorded under section 180 of the B.N.S.S. and there is an unexplained delay of over two months in lodging of the FIR.

5. The appeal is opposed by learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for the respondent no.2.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations in the FIR, the material



that has transpired in course of investigation including the statement of the victim recorded under section 180 of the B.N.S.S. wherein she has supported the prosecution case, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the appellant on anticipatory bail and the same is rejected.

7. The appellant is directed to surrender in the learned Court below within a period of four weeks.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

saauravkrsinha/-

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

