

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.79868 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-151 Year-2025 Thana- SUGAULI District- East Champaran

Anand Kumar Son of Arun Kumar Mahto @ Arun Mahto Resident Of Village
-Shyampur Baithaniya, Ps -Majhauriya, Dist -West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Lal Mati Devi Wife of Rakesh Mahto Resident of village- Sugaodih, Po and
Ps- Sugauli, dist- East Champaran

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pravin Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

5 25-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection
with Sugauli P.S. Case No. 151 of 2025 registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 96, 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023
and Section 8 of the POCSO Act.

3. The case of the prosecution in short is that the
minor daughter of the informant was kidnapped by the
petitioner and others. It is also alleged that the victim was
carrying Rs. 40,000/-.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has



committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He also submits that after knowing the truth, the informant has filed a compromise petition. He further submits that a statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner has no criminal antecedent and he is languishing in judicial custody since 01.09.2025.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State and submits that from perusal of the statement of the victim, it is clear that the victim has specifically stated that this petitioner has committed wrong act with her in the room. As per the medical examination report, the victim is a minor, and from perusal of the medical examination report of the victim, she was aged about 17-18 years. The victim has stated before the medical board also that she was being raped by this petitioner, though the board has not given any objective finding regarding rape.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage, however, he may renew his prayer for bail after six months.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.



8. The learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial so as to conclude the same in the time limit as provided under Section 35 of the POCSO Act.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

