

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36553 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-44 Year-2025 Thana- RANIYATALAB District- Patna

=====

Sintu Kumar S/o Umesh Yadav Resident of village- Aandhari Mathiya, P.S.-
Ranitalab, Distt- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Gopal Ji S/o Late Ajay Yadav R/o Vill- Aandhari Mathiya, P.S.- Ranitalab,
Distt- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Nawal Kishore Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam, A.P.P.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

5 05-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Ranitalab P.S. Case No. 44 of 2025, instituted for the
offences under Sections 8 and 12 of the POCSO Act and Section
66 E of the I.T. Act.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner and
the other co-accused made viral objectionable photographs of
the informant's minor sister. It is alleged that petitioner
allegedly caught hold the minor girl while she was going to
attend call of nature.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. The
F.I.R. is written after a lapse of three days of incident. The
victim girl desires to live with the petitioner. He further



submitted that nothing has been whispered against the petitioner in Section 183 of the BNSS statement of the victim. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has three criminal antecedents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. The petitioner caught hold the victim with bad intention. The petitioner has made viral objectionable video of the victim. Therefore, petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of offences, in my view, this is not a fit case for anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the learned court below within a period of six weeks from today and prays for regular bail, the same shall be disposed of on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

