

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37910 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2026 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Jehanabad

Nitin Raj @ Sonu @ Somu S/o Dharmendra Prasad @ Sukhu Resident of
Village - Ratanpura, P.S. - Islampur, District Nalanda, At present - Sheopuri
Ramchandrapur, P.S. - Laheri, Dist. - Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Anurag Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 23-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 69, 352
and 351(2) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that she came in contact with the petitioner through
facebook who works as ESM with Railways in Madhya
Pradesh. Further, the petitioner pressurised her to meet, thus,
they met at the room of the informant in October 2020, but her
landlord disclosed to her family members that a boy had come
to meet her in her room, thus, the informant disclosed about her
relationship with her family members. Further, the petitioner



assured her mother that he will marry her in 2024, thereafter petitioner on pretext of marriage started establishing physical relation and even made obscene video of the informant. Further, the informant went back to village from Patna as she did not qualify in competitive examination and the petitioner continued with the relationship and even made WhatsApp call and used to see her private parts and ultimately refused to marry.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that she came in contact with the petitioner in the year 2020 and thereafter the relationship continued and six years after the commencement of the relationship, the instant FIR came to be instituted. It is next submitted that the relationship in between the petitioner and the informant was a consensual relationship between two consenting adults. It is also submitted that it does not appear probable that the informant who claims that she was staying in Patna and was preparing for competitive examination would not have realized in 5-6 years of relationship that petitioner does not intend to marry. It is further submitted that no doubt, petitioner and the informant were in a



relationship but then there was no promise of marriage. It is next submitted that whenever consensual relationship sours, a false case is instituted. It is also submitted that in order to give seriousness to the case, it is alleged that petitioner videographed some of the occurrence but then no such video transpired during the course of investigation. It is submitted that if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence and will remain present before the Investigating Officer of the case as and when required.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, let the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Jehanabad (Mahila) P.S. Case No. 10 of 2026, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the B.N.S.S.



7. One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his aunt, namely, Rinku Kumari.

8. However, it is made clear that if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned Trial Court bringing to its notice that the petitioner, despite giving assurance to this Court, is not cooperating in the investigation, the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

