IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52102 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010648772026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-164 Year-2025 Thana- KISHANPUR District- Supaul

==========

Pappu Yadav Son of Sri Premlal Yadav Resident of Village- Dighiya Ward No 11, PS -Kishanpur, District -Supaul.

... ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. XXX son of Kusum Lal Poddar Resident of Village- Dighiya PS -Kishanpur, District -Supaul

... ... Opposite Parties

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amrit Abhijat, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Damodar Prasad Tiwary, A.P.P.

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

4 29-10-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned APP for the State. Perused the Case Diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Kishanpur P.S. case No. 164 of 2025, corresponding to POCSO Case No. 99 of 2025, instituted for the offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 76, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under Sections 4 and 8 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 11.08.2025 at about 11:00 P.M., the informant’s minor daughter, aged about 11 years, was sleeping at her home while the informant and his family members were engaged in performing the *Shradh* rituals.

WEB COPY

In the meantime, Pappu Yadav (petitioner) allegedly entered the informant's house, threatened and molested his minor daughter, and attempted to rape her. It is further alleged that, after the feast, when the informant and his family members returned home, the victim, while crying, narrated the entire incident to them. Thereafter, during a discussion held at the social level regarding the alleged incident, the accused was sought to be subjected to severe punishment. However, it is alleged that Dinesh Yadav, using abusive and derogatory language, boycotted the discussion and attempted to protect the accused. The informant subsequently took his daughter to the Community Health Centre (C.H.C.), Kishanpur, for medical treatment.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 12.03.2026 and has no criminal antecedents. It is also submitted that the petitioner's earlier application for anticipatory bail was rejected by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 24.02.2026 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 87551 of 2025. Learned counsel further submits that there is a case and counter-case between the

WEB COPY

parties. He also submits that there are significant contradictions between the statements of the victim recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of the BNSS. The counsel lastly submits that the victim's parents declined to have her medically examined.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. He further submits that in the statement of victim recorded u/s 183 of the BNSS, she fully supported the case of the prosecution.

6. Having heard the parties and taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the offence and keeping in view the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

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

8. The learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same within a period of six months.

(Alok Kumar, J)

manish/-

U		T	

WEB COPY