

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50291 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-63 Year-2025 Thana- DHORAIYA District- Banka

Md. Urisa @ Md. Altaf S/O Md. Jabbar R/O Village- Fattuchak, P.S-
Dhoraiya, Distt.- Banka.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sarswati Devi W/O Arun Mandal R/O Village- Falluchak, P.S- Dhoraiya,
Distt.- Banka. A/P Daughter of Sagar Mandal R/O Village- Sonudih, P.S-
Goradih, Dist.- Bhagalpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Advocate Mr. Brij Nandan Prasad, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Atul Kumar, Advocate Mr. Rabindra Kumar, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

5 08-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as
informant and learned APP for the State.

2. In this case, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in
connection with Dhoraiya P.S. Case No. 63 of 2025, registered for
the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 65(2) of the BNS and
3/4 of POCSO Act.

3. As per allegation, the petitioner committed rape
upon 7 years old daughter of the informant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted
that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the
present case. He has further submitted that occurrence took place on



26.08.2024 and complaint was filed on 04.10.2024 which shows that there is delay of about two months in lodging the complaint without giving any proper explanation. The petitioner is a person of clean antecedent and is in custody since 16.04.2025.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that complaint shows that after commission of rape, the victim was not able even to move and family members of the complainant prohibited her from lodging of this case. Later on, with assistance of other persons, her daughter was medically examined. The victim, in her statements under Section 180 and 183 of the BNSS, has supported the prosecution case and described the factum of entire case.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, in my view, the petitioner does not deserve privilege of bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

7. The learned Court below is directed to expedite the trial.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

priyanka/-

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

