

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17306 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-27 Year-2024 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Jamui

Sachin Kumar S/O Tripurari Singh Resident Of Vill.- Jamui Khairiya, P.s.-
Jhajha, Distt.- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Smt. X W/O Y R/O Nimarang, Ward no. 29, P.O. and P.S. and Dist.- Jamui,
811307

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anisha Sinha, Advocate Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sinha
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Binod Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 25-03-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Jamui Mahila P.S. Case No. 27 of 2024, registered for the offence under Sections 366A, 376D, 506 of the Indian Penal Code and section 4 and 6 of the POCSO Act lodged on 05.05.2024 by the informant, Arti Devi.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged that her daughter went out to purchase some household materials but failed to return. Later, received phone call from RPF, Patna Junction informing that she is under the protection of the said RPF. The victim girl narrated that in an auto, four persons including this petitioner took her away, went to the



forest in a one room thrashed her and further allegation is that minor daughter was repeatedly raped by all of them. She was later left at the Jamui Railway Station whereafter she took the RPF. This led to the FIR u/s 366(A), 376(D)/506 of the IPC and u/s 4/6 of the POCSO Act.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the informant and the accused persons are close relatives and there was an affair with the elder sister which was unacceptable to the informant.

5. Learned APP, on the other hand submits that from the FIR, it is clear that the minor girl has alleged that the petitioner has raped her along with her associates.

6. Considering the aforesaid submission of the parties and also the material available on record and the allegation which has been made against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to extend him privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

