

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5336 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-93 Year-2025 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Saran

Kaju Kumar @ Kaju Manjhi S/O Satendra Manjhi R/O Village- Chandanpur,
Police Station- Khaira, District- Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Khushboo Kumari At present Addl. S.H.O., P.S- Mahila P.S, Distt.- Saran, Chapra.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs.Mili Kumari, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Priya Sharan Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 28-01-2026 Heard Mrs.Mili Kumari, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Ram Priya Sharan Singh, learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail, who is in custody since 25.11.2025 in connection with POCSO (Mahila) P.S. Case No. 93 of 2025, arising out of Mahila P.S.Case No.93 of 2025, F.I.R. dated 24.11.2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 79,11,141,143,145,98,296,3(5)of BNS, Sections 13,14 of POCSO Act, Section 79 of J.J.Act and Section 16 of Bonded Labour Act, 1976.

3. According to prosecution case, two girls, namely,



Anjali Mahto and Saniya Kumari, both aged 17 years alongwith Khushi Praveen were found in premises of Pooja Orchestra and Khushi Praveen disclosed name of the petitioner as operator of Pooja Orchestra.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the informant is police personnel so notice is not required under the POCSO Act. Further submits that the allegation as alleged in the FIR is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. The petitioner is Tent owner of the Orchestra Party and he has no concern at all with the allegation as alleged in the FIR. In fact the petitioner was present in the Pooja Orchestra and he has been taken into custody on 24.11.2025 itself and the girls were recovered from the place of occurrence and the girls have not stated anything about the petitioner and petitioner has no concern at all with the other co-accused persons and the petitioner is in custody since 25.11.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, on the other hand, has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner carries one more case other than the present one, as mentioned in para-3 of the bail petition.



6. Considering the aforesaid facts, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Exclusive Special Judge, POCSO, Saran, Chapra in connection with POCSO (Mahila) P.S. Case No. 93 of 2025, arising out of Mahila P.S. Case No.93 of 2025, with the following conditions:-

(I) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/her bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(II) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(III) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned



order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of
verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

