

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13392 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-123 Year-2025 Thana- Cyber P.S. District- Saran

=====

Pankaj Kumar @ Pankaj Kumar Gupta Son of Krishna Sah @ Krishna Pd.
Sah Resident Of Village -Bhimpurwa, Ps -Mahmmadpur, Dist -Gopalganj
Presently Resident at Mahamadpur, Ps- Mahamadpur, Dist- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manager Sah, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 24-06-2026 Heard Mr. Manager Shah, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Bharat Bhushan, learned APP representing

the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Saran Cyber P.S. Case No. 123 of 2025
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 66E, 67 and
67A of the I.T. Act as also 75, 77, 78, 79, 356(2), 352, 351(2)
and 351(4) of the B.N.S., lodged on 16.04.2025 by the
informant Ishita Kumari.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged
that she met the petitioner in a marriage ceremony, they came
closer and in the process established physical relationship.



However, he snapped certain photographs and also made videos and then her marriage was settled with other boy, those photographs/videos were forwarded to the would be in-laws which resulted into breakup of the marriage. The videos became viral and left with as such, she was forced to lodge this FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the girl is major, both entered into relationship knowing fully well and only to ensure that the petitioner solemnized marriage with her, the present FIR.

5. Learned APP Mr. Bharat Bhushan, on the other hand opposes prayer submitting that the allegation is beyond the physical relationship inasmuch as photographs/videos were prepared and it was forwarded to the would be in-laws which resulted not into only breakup of the marriage, the videos also became viral.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submit that the informant subsequently has submitted petition before the court concerned to make Section 67 of IT Act compoundable. These are the facts which can be addressed by the court concerned when the petitioner seek bail after surrender.

7. Taking into account aforesaid facts, no relief can be extended to the petitioner, the anticipatory bail application



stands rejected.

8. However, if the petitioner surrenders within a period of four weeks, files bail application, the court concerned shall consider the matter and dispose it of preferably on the same day.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/Ankita

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

