

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10245 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-943 Year-2025 Thana- RAMKRISHNANAGAR District- Patna

Anirudh Kumar Sinha S/O Baban Prasad R/O Village- Saidpura Khagaul, P.S-
Khagaul, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Amit Anand, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Amitesh Kumar, A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Piyush Kumar Pandey, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 02-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since
03.12.2025 in connection with Ram Krishna Nagar P.S. Case
No. 943 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections
126(2), 352, 351(2), 76, 64, 85 and 3(5) of BNS and Sections 3
and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. The prosecution story, in brief, is that the informant
marriage was fixed with Abhishek Kumar, but before fixing of
marriage they had seen her several times at various locations. It
is further alleged that after arranging of marriage her parents
beyond their means borrowed money from relatives and well



wishers and gave approximately Rs.29 Lakh in cash as a gift to the groom's father and others. On 7.6.2025, her engagement with Abhishek Kumar took place. On the occasion of the engagement her parents gave gifts to Abhishek Kumar, her father and mother over which a cost of Rs.5,00,000/- incurred and the wedding date was fixed on 4.12.2025. It is further alleged that meanwhile brother in law of Abhishek namely Anirudh Kumar started talking to her and asked her to talk to Abhishek on the phone, but she refused and said that she would talk after the wedding. But due to repeated insistence, she started talking with Abhishek. And during their talk Abhishek insisted to meet her on the pretext that since they were engaged, there was no problem in meeting. But due to pressure of Abhishek and his mother Poonam Devi she agreed to meet him. She met him at Marine Drive on 17.6.2025, from where he forcibly took her to his house at Rajapur and that day no one was present in the house and forcibly established physical relationship with her and after that he established physical relation with her several times even in the car on the pretext that they are going to be married. It is also alleged that Anirudh 24.1.2026 misbehaved with her, touched her body inappropriately, and did very wrong things to her. He started



removing her clothes, and when she screamed he hit her. But later Abhishek and his family members refused to marry her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the allegation as alleged in the FIR is forged and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. As per the allegation as alleged in the FIR, the petitioner had tried to commit rape upon the victim. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in fact, the petitioner is brother-in-law of the proposed groom, namely, Abhishek Kumar. It is further submitted that from bare perusal of the FIR it appears that the date of occurrence is 12.10.2025 and the FIR has been instituted on 04.11.2025 i.e., after a delay of about one month which shows that the informant in order to falsely implicate the petitioner and his family members has filed this case. Apart from aforesaid, medical report also does not support the allegation as leveled in the FIR and the police after investigation has submitted charge-sheet and petitioner is in custody since 03.12.2025.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for the informant, on the other hand,



have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the fact that FIR has been instituted after a delay of month, 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 the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class-XV, Civil Court, Patna in connection with Ram Krishna Nagar P.S. Case No. 943 of 2025, subject to 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 absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be canceled 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)

Gaurav Sinha/-

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

