

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63415 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-237 Year-2025 Thana- RANIYATALAB District- Patna

Ravi Ranjan Kumar S/o Dhodho Yadav R/o Village - Patut, P.O + PS - Rani Talab, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sanjay Ram Son of Late Chhathu Mochi Resident of Village- Patut, P.S. Rani Talab, District- Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms.Muskan Singh, Advocate
For the informant	:	Mr.Pushpendra Priyadarshi, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Jitendra Kumar Singh, App

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 11-02-2026 Heard Ms. Muskan Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, learned APP for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in connection with Special POCSO Case No.179/2025 arising out Rani Talab P.S.Case No.237 of 2025 passed in ABP No.3065 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 74, 75, 352, 351(2), 351(3) of BNS and Sections 8 and 12 of POCSO Act and Section 3(i)(r)(s)(w) & Section 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act.

3. As per the allegation made in the FIR, the petitioner



allegedly committed wrong with the daughter of the informant and has also used his caste name in the public place.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent, aged about 22 years and has not committed the offence as alleged in the FIR. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case due to a family dispute with the informant and his father. The petitioner has clean antecedent and he has never been involved in any criminal case. On these grounds, the petitioner seeks to be released on pre-arrest bail.

5. Mr. Pushpendra Priyadarshi has tendered his appearance on behalf of the informant and submitted that the allegation made in the FIR is supported by the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of BNSS, wherein she has stated the manner in which the incident took place and the wrong was committed with her by the petitioner, as such, the petitioner does not deserve to be released on pre-arrest bail.

6. Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, learned APP for the State, referring to paragraph no. 6 of the case diary, submitted that during the course of investigation, the Investigating Officer has found that the place of occurrence is the '*Gaushala*'. He further submitted with reference to the statement of the victim



girl recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS that the victim has supported the prosecution case regarding the incident. The victim girl in her statement has stated the place of occurrence '*Dalan*'.

7. Having considered the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties and upon perusal of the allegations made in the FIR, the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, as well as, the materials that have surfaced during the course of investigation, this Court finds that the Investigating Officer has identified the place of occurrence as a "*Gaushala*," as recorded in paragraph no. 6 of the case diary and in response to a specific query made by this Court regarding the exact location of the alleged place of occurrence, it was clarified that the said *Gaushala* is situated behind the house of the petitioner and is covered by a curtain, preventing visibility from outside but the victim girl in her statement recorded under Section 183 of BNSS has stated the place of occurrence '*Dalan*', as well as, there appears to be a material contradiction with respect to the allegation of the informant, who claims to have witnessed the incident with his open eyes. However, the statement of the victim recorded before the learned Judicial Magistrate indicates that the *Dalan* is located behind the house,



covered by a curtain and nothing is visible from outside. In such circumstances, the statement of the informant being the eye witness becomes doubtful.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and further taking into account the contradiction in the statement of the victim, informant and the petitioner, who is aged about 22 years, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has been able to make out a *prima facie* case for grant of pre-arrest bail.

9. The learned district court is directed to release the petitioner on pre-arrest bail, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned district court within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned District and Additional Sessions Judge-VII cum Exclusive Special Judge, POCSO, Patna/concerned court, in connection with Special POCSO Case No.179/2025 arising out of Rani Talab P.S.Case No.237 of 2025, subject to conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS of 2023.

10. The learned district court is directed to verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and if it is found that the petitioner is involved in some other cases as what has been



stated in paragraph No.3 of the bail application, this order will
automatically lose its force.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

chn/-

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

