

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18067 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-318 Year-2024 Thana- NAANPUR District- Sitamarhi

=====

Anzar Ahmad Son of Md. Mushtaq Resident of Village - Budhanagar, P.S.-
Nanpur, District - Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Noushad Khan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 18-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The instant application for anticipatory bail has been
filed by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection
with Nanpur P.S. Case no. 318 of 2024 instituted for the
offence under Sections 341, 323, 354(B), 376, 313, 379, 504,
506/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that the
petitioner has established a physical relationship with the
informant on the false promise of marriage. It is further alleged
that a video was also made of the act and when she got
pregnant, she was promised marriage. It is alleged that she was
administered medicine, due to which a miscarriage took place.
The informant is a divorced lady.



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has falsely been implicated in this case. He also submits that no such occurrence has taken place and the petitioner got no such relationship with the informant. He further submits that the informant has filed an affidavit which goes to show that he has also filed a case against Md. Faisal and in that case, he has filed a compromise petition. Moreover, a statement has been made in para-3 of this petition that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent.

5. In contra, learned APP appearing for the State and learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer of bail of the petitioner.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that there is an allegation against the petitioner of committing rape with the informant on the false promise of marriage, this court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and as such, his prayer for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

7. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the trial Court and pray for regular bail, the same shall be considered by the trial Court, without being prejudiced by



this order of rejection.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

