

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75402 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-287 Year-2022 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Ravindra Sahni @ Ravindra Kumar S/o Surendra Sahni R/o Village-
Kodhipatti, P.S.- Mahindwara, District- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Parwati Devi W/o Darab Das R/o Village- Manpur Ratnawali, P.S.-
Runnisaipur, District- Sitamarhi

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Pronoti Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 11-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered
for the offence punishable under Section 366(A) of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that on 31.05.2022, the accused persons including the
petitioner enticed her minor daughter and took her somewhere
and thus, suspects that she might have been killed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by the



informant as there is dispute relating to passage between them. It is also submitted that the informant herself produced the victim on 05.06.2022 before the police and thereafter her statement was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. wherein she supported the case of the prosecution. It is further submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that how the informant came to know where the victim was and how she was produced. It is also submitted that the date of occurrence is 31.05.2022 and the FIR was instituted on 03.06.2022, i.e., after a delay of three days. It is next submitted that the delay in instituting the FIR was utilized by the informant in concealing the victim so that she could be produced when required and, accordingly, on 05.06.2022, i.e., two days after the institution of the FIR, the victim was produced. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits at the cost of repetition that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation and will present himself as and when required by the Investigating Officer of the case during the course of investigation.

5. Learned APP opposes the anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the submissions made by learned



counsel for the petitioner, let petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rs. Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned A.D.J.-IV-cum-Exclusive Special Judge (Rape and POCSO), Sitamarhi in connection with Runnisaipur P.S. Case No.287 of 2022, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

7. However, it is made clear that in the event, if any application is filed by the Investigating Officer before the learned Trial Court bringing to its notice that 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 after recording reasons.

8. Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned police station through the learned court below.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sanjay/-

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

