

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13347 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-120 Year-2025 Thana- Patour District- Darbhanga

Manish Kumar Yadav S/o- Barun Kumar Yadav @ Barun Yadav @ Varun
Yadav Village- Basatpur, P.S- Pator, District- Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajeev Ranjan, Advocate Ms. Vibha Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

2 12-03-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Pator P.S. Case no.120 of 2025, registered under sections 76 and 87 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that the petitioner herein came to his house and tried to force himself upon his 20 year old daughter. It is further stated that in the year 2024 also, a similar occurrence had taken place for which an FIR being Pator P.S. Case no. 68 of 2024 was registered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner happens to be the son-in-law of the informant who



was married to Neha Kumari. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. In evidence of the fact that marriage has taken place between the informant's daughter and the petitioner, the petitioner refers to an FIR at Annexure-2 lodged by Neha Kumari being Pator P.S. Case no. 68 of 2024. The petitioner is in custody since 6.12.2025 and has no other case except the two cases both lodged by the informant and his daughter. He undertakes to cooperate in the investigation/trial.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State, who submits that there is direct allegation against the petitioner of having attempted to commit rape on the daughter of the informant. Further referring to the FIR at Annexure-2, learned APP for the State submits that it is not an evidence of marriage between the parties but in fact the daughter of the informant while lodging the FIR had categorically stated therein that under the garb of future marriage, the petitioner had committed rape on her.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegation against the petitioner in the FIR wherein the petitioner is for the second time alleged to have attempted to commit rape on the daughter of the informant, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the



application is rejected.

7. Learned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Shiv/-

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

