

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78933 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-85 Year-2023 Thana- JAMUI District- Jamui

=====

Amit Kumar @ Amit Yadav S/o Kamdev Yadav Resident of Rajpura, P.S.-
Jamui, Dist.- Jamui, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. X Wife of Subodh Yadav Resident of Rajpura, P.S.- Jamui, District- Jamui,
Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jyoti Ranjan Jha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajiv Nayan

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 30-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Jamui P.S. Case No.85/2023, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 341, 354(c), 354(B), 504, 506 and 34
of the Indian Penal Code and Section 8 of POCSO Act.

3. The Court at the outset made a specific query to the
learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that
whether the allegation of making inappropriate picture of the
victim viral has been denied or not, on which, the learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the
same has not been denied. It is next submitted that petitioner is a
person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that
Amit used to act inappropriate with her minor daughter, further



on 26.01.2023 at 8 A.M. while the victim was taking bath at the hand-pump, accused Amit and Guddu clicked her inappropriate picture with their mobile and based on the inappropriate picture, the accused persons started calling the victim to meet them and when the victim refused they threatened that the picture would be made viral, hence the victim disclosed about the ordeal to the informant, accordingly the informant confronted the accused when the pictures were made viral and also threatened that they will pore acid on the victim.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the date of occurrence is 26.01.2023 and the FIR came to be instituted on 09.02.2023. It is further submitted that one Kamdeo Yadav instituted Jamui P.S. Case No.86 of 2023 dated 09.02.2023 against the son of the present informant namely Rajeev alleging that Rajeev along with named accused persons acted inappropriately with his daughter. It is also submitted that notices were issued on the O.P. No.2 but then the office report records that informant could not be traced which amply demonstrates that informant is not interested in pursuing the



case.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the FIR has been instituted by the mother of the victim with an allegation that inappropriate picture of her daughter was made viral by the accused persons including the petitioner. It is also submitted that it does not appear probable that a mother would want to falsely implicate someone who was not involved in the occurrence. It is also submitted that had the picture not been made viral, in that event, a pleading to that effect would have been made in the anticipatory bail application but then it has been fairly submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the said allegation has not been denied.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

