

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9424 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-312 Year-2025 Thana- DAGARUA District- Purnia

=====

Pappu Ray @ Pramod Ray @ Pappu Kumar @ Pramod Kumar Ray Son of
Dayalal Ray Resident of Fulpur Chakdah, Ward no. 5, P.S. - Dagarua, District
- Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Md Fazle Karim, Advocate
For the State : Mr.Parmanand Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 20-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner; learned APP
for the State and

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Dagarua P.S. Case No. 312 of 2025 registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 64, 76, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Pursuant to the order dated 06.04.2026, the then
SHO of Dagarua, Purnea has appeared and has accepted his
mistake and has assured this Court that he will not repeat this
mistake in future.

4. The petitioner is the *devar* of the informant and is
alleged to have committed rape with her.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



informant is a woman having three children and there is a land dispute since before between the parties. He has also relied upon the documents of the land dispute and has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case.

6. Learned counsel for the informant has vehemently opposed the application for bail.

7. Considering the relationship and the materials regarding previous land dispute as well as the clean antecedent of the petitioner, this application is allowed.

8. Let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned C.J.M., Purnea/ concerned Court in connection with Dagarua P.S. Case No. 312 of 2025.

9. As a condition of this order, the petitioner, after being released on bail is directed to co-operate in the trial either by appearing personally or through his lawyer in the trial Court on each and every date fixed in the trial. Non-compliance of the condition will result in cancellation of the bail bonds of the petitioner.

10. The personal appearance of the SHO is dispensed with.



11. It is, however, clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the adjudication of the present bail application and shall not prejudice the case of the petitioner at any subsequent stage of the trial and this Court has not express any opinion on the merits of the case.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

