

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.51300 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-51 Year-2025 Thana- MANJHI District- Saran

=====

Satyanarayan Manjhi @ Babuaji S/o Chizhu Manjhi RO Village- Jaitiya, PS-
Manjhi, District- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Pinki Kumari D/o Raju Ram R/o vill - Jaitiya, P.S.- Manjhi, Distt.- Saran

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Ms. Chetna, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, APP
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate
		Mrs. Shyama Rani, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

7 11-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the opposite party no.2 and learned APP for the
State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for
the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 115 (2), 70(2) and
3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, Section 6 of the POCSO
Act and Section 67A and 67B of the IT Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the allegation in
the F.I.R. is that the petitioner along with two other co-accused
has made forceful sexual relation with the informant and also
made video.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the



petitioner that the present F.I.R. has been lodged after a delay of four days inasmuch as the occurrence is said to have taken place on 08.02.2025, while the F.I.R. was lodged on 12.02.2025, without tendering any plausible explanation. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case due to previous enmity as both the parties are residents of the same village. Further, the entire story of Ashish Kumar being assaulted and sent away and then the act of rape committed, appears to be not believable. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and has been languishing in custody since 14.02.2025.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that the allegations are direct and specific against this petitioner and this petitioner and one Dinesh Sah had forcefully made relationship with the victim, which fact stands supported by the statement of the victim recorded under Section 180 and 183 of the BNSS during course of investigation.

6. Taking into consideration facts and circumstance of the case, the seriousness of the allegation as also the age and the statement of the victim, I am not inclined to enlarge the



petitioner on bail. The prayer for bail is hereby rejected.
However, the learned Trial Court is directed to proceed with the
case expeditiously keeping in mind that the present case is one
under the provisions of the POCSO Act.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Trivedi/-

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

