

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80906 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-69 Year-2025 Thana- GAURICHAK District- Patna

Deepak Kumar son of Pramod Saw @ Pramendra Sav @ Nirkal Saw Resident
of Village- ward no.14, Ram Nagar, Police Station- Masaurhi, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. sheela devi wife of Nabal Paswan Resident Of village- Kajibigha, Ps-
Gauribigha, Dist- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Balwant Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Usha Kumari 1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

6 01-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Section 76 of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, Sections 8 and 12 of the POCSO Act,
and Sections 3(2)(v)(a) of SC/ST Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
notices were issued on 22-1-2026, thereafter again on 10-3-
2026, but the notice was not received by the informant as such
by order dated 22-4-2026, the petitioner was directed to make
paper publication. It is further submitted that despite paper
publication, the informant chooses not to appear and contest.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that her minor daughter aged about 12 years had gone to attend the nature's call at 7 PM, when she was intercepted by the petitioner, Mantosh and Himanshu, who took her to a field and tried to commit wrong, but on alarm, accused fled.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that it does not appear probable that had three persons tried to commit wrong with the minor daughter of the informant, in that event, she would have been in a position to raise alarm. It is thus submitted that this perhaps explains why informant despite valid service of notice chooses not to appear and contest.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial



court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Gaurichak P.S. Case No. 69 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

