

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3451 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-624 Year-2025 Thana- SHASTRINAGAR District- Patna

Rahul Kumar @ Rahul S/O Sanjay Kumar Mandal @ Sanjay Mandal R/O
Village- Prahlad Nagar, P.S.- Nalanda, District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Anamika Kumari W/O Rakesh Kumar R/O Mangalam Mansion, Aadarsh Path, Patel Nagar, P.S.- Shastri Nagar, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Abhishek Kumar Vivek, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Amit Kumar Anand, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

6 22-06-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, informant and the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends arrest in Shastri Nagar P. S.
Case No. 624 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 64 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Sections 8, 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act.

3. As per F.I.R., this petitioner, being driver of the informant, secretly recorded objectionable videos of informant and her minor daughter and started blackmailing them. It is further alleged that petitioner forcibly established physical relation with the informant by threatening her to make the



videos viral. On 15.08.2025, petitioner again tried to molest informant and upon protest, this petitioner committed theft of Rs. 15,000/- and jewellery worth Rs. 50,000/- from the house of informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Petitioner has never worked as the driver of informant. As a matter of fact, informant runs a gym in the name and style 'Cross fit Gym' where she is also a trainer. Petitioner had taken admission in the said gym and later on, both petitioner and informant became close to each other. Thereafter, they had taken a commercial premises on rent for running other gym in which petitioner bought some gym equipments and invested Rs. 50,000/- in the business. It is further submitted that informant is living separately from her husband from ten years and wanted to marry petitioner but when petitioner refused the proposal, this false and concocted case was lodged against him. Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that petitioner is named in the F.I.R. with specific accusation that he sexually assaulted informant



and made objectionable videos of informant and her daughter.
During investigation, daughter of the informant also supported
the prosecution case.

6. Considering the nature and seriousness of
accusation, prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is
refused.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Navya/-

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

