

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4916 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-23 Year-2025 Thana- MAHILA THANA District- Begusarai

PINTU KHALIFA @ VISWARANJAN KUMAR S/o- Ashok Khalifa R/v-
Nadail Ghat Meerkalapur Ps- Bakhri Dist- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Shilpee Kumari D/o- Venkatesh Kumar Singh Presently Posted as Station Head Officer, Begusarai Mahila Ps Dist- Begusarai

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Jagdish Prasad Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANSUL
ORAL ORDER

5 27-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Begusarai Mahila P.S. Case No. 23 of 2025, registered under Sections 143, 144(1), 144(2), 64(1), 111, 98, 99, 70, 145 and 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 7, 6, 3, 4 and 5 of the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, Sections 4, 8 and 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, Section 18 of the Child Labour Act and Sections 75 and 79 of the Juvenile Justice Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner is the husband of one Jago Devi, at whose house a raid was carried out



and a victim girl was recovered therefrom. It appears from the prosecution materials that the said premises was being used as a brothel. The principal thrust of the prosecution's allegation, however, is directed against one Rahul Kumar. The petitioner's role, as reflected in the First Information Report, is as a co-habitant of the raided premises rather than as a primary operator of the alleged brothel.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. A supplementary affidavit has been filed on behalf of the petitioner, in which the victim girl has not attributed any act of kidnapping or commission of any immoral act to the petitioner. It is further submitted that a similarly situated co-accused, namely, Jago Devi, has been granted regular bail by a coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 10.11.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 75071 of 2025. The petitioner has been in custody since 29.11.2025.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this application is allowed. The petitioner has been in



judicial custody since 29.11.2025, which is a period exceeding five months. As per the First Information Report, the primary and principal allegations in this case are directed against one Rahul Kumar; the petitioner's role is that of a co-habitant of the premises where the raid was carried out, and no specific overt act has been attributed to him in the core allegations. The victim girl, in her supplementary affidavit, has not attributed any act of kidnapping or immoral conduct to the petitioner. The co-accused Jago Devi, who is the petitioner's wife and whose nexus with the alleged activities is arguably more proximate, has already been enlarged on regular bail by a coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 10.11.2025 in Cr. Misc. No. 75071 of 2025. The petitioner stands on a footing at least as favourable as Jago Devi and is, therefore, entitled to the benefit of parity. There is, at this stage, no material before this Court to suggest that the petitioner, if enlarged on bail, is likely to tamper with evidence, intimidate witnesses, or flee from justice. The gravity of the statutory provisions invoked is not, by itself, a sufficient ground to deny bail in the present circumstances, given the peripheral nature of the petitioner's role as discernible from the prosecution materials. In view of the above, this application is allowed.

7. Accordingly, let the petitioner above-named be



released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Only) with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of the learned District and Additional Sessions Judge-VI-cum-Special Judge of POCSO Act, Begusarai/concerned court below, in connection with Begusarai Mahila P.S. Case No. 23 of 2025.

8. It is made clear that any observation made herein is prima facie in nature and limited solely for the purpose of adjudication of the present bail application. Such observations shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and shall not influence the trial or any other proceedings in any manner.

(Ansul, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

