

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA  
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1109 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-7 Year-2026 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Chaman Kumar Chaudhary @ Amarendra Kumar S/O Manoj Chaudhary R/O  
Village- Baghari, Ward no 07, P.S- Runnisaidpur, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Manisha Kumari D/O Ravindra Ram R/O Village- Baghari, P.S-  
Runnisaidpur, Distt- Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Sinha, Advocate  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Binay Krishna, SPP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA  
ORAL ORDER**

4      25-06-2026                      Despite valid service of notice, no one appears on  
behalf of the Respondent No. 2.

2. Heard Mr. Pramod Kumar Sinha, learned counsel  
for the appellant as well as Mr. Binay Krishna, learned Spl.P.P.  
for the State.

3. This is an appeal under Sections 14(A)(2) against  
refusal of the prayer for regular bail by order dated 05.02.2026  
passed by the learned Court of 1st Additional Sessions Judge-  
cum-Special Judge, SC/ST (POA) Act, Sitamarhi in connection  
with Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 07 of 2026, F.I.R. dated  
07.01.2026 registered under Sections 115(2), 126, 127(2), 64,  
352, 351(3) and 79 of the BNS, 2023 and Section 3(i)(r)(s) and



3(i)(w)(ii) of the SC/ST Act.

4. According to the prosecution case, this appellant entered into the house of the victim and dragged her to Banswari and committed rape upon her and also assaulted her by means of Scythe.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. Apart from aforesaid, the date of occurrence as alleged in the FIR is 02.01.2026 but the present FIR has been instituted on 07.01.2026 after delay of 5 days without giving any explanation of the said delay only to falsely implicate the appellant in the present case.

6. Learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State on the basis of material available on record and the case diary has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant and submits that the victim was recovered and statement of the victim was recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, 2023 in which she has fully supported the case of the prosecution and as far as medical report is concerned, the Medical Board has only verified the age of the victim and suggested that the victim was between 14 to 17 years of age which means she was minor at the time of occurrence.



7. Considering the nature of allegation as alleged in the FIR supported by the medical evidence, I am not inclined to enlarge the appellant on bail in connection with Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 07 of 2026 pending in the Court of learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, SC/ST (POA) Act, Sitamarhi.

8. Accordingly, the impugned order is affirmed and this appeal stands dismissed.

**(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)**

Vanisha/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

