

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8361 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-103 Year-2025 Thana- JANKINAGAR District- Purnia

Chandan Kumar Bharti Son of Dev Naryan Mehta @ Deo Narayan Mehta
Resident of Village - Sahuriya Subhai(Subhay) Milik ward no. 09, P.S.-
Jankinagar, District - Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Ambrish Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Raj Kishor Singh
	Mr.Shambhu Sharan Singh
	Mr.Rima Sahay

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 23-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on
behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for
the offences punishable under Sections 69, 294 and 351(2)
of the B.N.S.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits
that the petitioner is in custody since 17.11.2025 and is a
person with clean antecedent. It is submitted that in sum
and substance the allegation is petitioner on pretext of false
promise of marriage established physical relation with the
informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the



allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the FIR was instituted in the Year 2025 when victim was 23 years of age and alleges that she was in a relationship with the petitioner since 2020 i.e. the relationship started when the victim was 18 years of age and thus was a major. It is also submitted that it does not appear probable that in five years the victim would not have realized that petitioner does not intend to marry. It is also submitted that relationship was in between two consenting adults and whenever such relationship sours a false case is instituted with an allegation that physical relation was established. It is also submitted that charges have been framed and if privilege of regular bail is granted, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the trial to prove his innocence.

4. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the bail application, but then, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that relationship in between petitioner and the informant was consensual and was in between two



consenting adults.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Jankinagar P. S. Case No.103 of 2025.

6. The application stands allowed.

7. However, it is made clear that if the learned trial court comes to a conclusion that petitioner after his release is trying the delay the trial in any manner, the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

8. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that though a submission has been made that charges against the petitioner stands framed but then the order of framing charge has not been brought on record.



9. It is made clear the learned trial Court before releasing the petitioner shall verify that as to whether charges against the petitioner has been framed or not and if it is found that charges against the petitioner has not been framed in that event the present order granting bail shall not be given effect to, but if charges have been framed in that event the petitioner shall be released forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

