

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80601 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-70 Year-2022 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Sheikhpura

Mukesh Kumar @ Mukesh Kumar Yadav Son of Late Mohan Yadav @ Late Mohan Prasad Yadav R/o Village - Sukhlahi, P.S. - Mainatand@ Mainatarh, Dist. - Bettiah.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Thakur, Advocate Mrs. Vaishnavi Singh, Advocate Mr. Ritwik Thakur, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 02-02-2026 Heard Mr. Ajay Kumar Thakur, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No. 70 of 2022 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 323, 376, 420 and 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution based on the complaint petition, in short is that the complainant is an educated unemployed lady. She came in connection with the petitioner, who is an assistant teacher working at village Gauripur. It is further alleged that the petitioner assured that he will arrange



government service for her, and it is alleged that the petitioner established physical relationship. It is further alleged that the petitioner kept the complainant at her house for many days and introduced her as his colleague. It is further alleged that from the year 2019 the petitioner has taken Rs. 4 lakhs for arranging a government job for the complainant and that he has established physical relationship on this score only.

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. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at *Annexure-3*, there is also an FIR filed by the complainant in this case, which states that her marriage was fixed with one Rajiv Ranjan Pandey. Rajiv Ranjan Pandey had assured that he will marry her, and on this assurance, she went with him to Rajrappa Mandir, where he established physical relationship with her. Whenever she objected, he threatened her of committing suicide. This shows that the complainant is in the habit of implicating the youth on the ground of forceful sexual intercourse on this or that pretext.

5. It has also been submitted that, as per the complaint petition, there is an allegation that from the year 2019, the



petitioner cheated her of Rs. 4 lakhs on the pretext of arranging government job, whereas this complaint was lodged in the year 2022. There is no explanation for the delay. He further submits that the complainant and the petitioner both are majors. He also submits that from the perusal of the complaint petition itself, it is clear that there is no forceful sexual intercourse and only allegation is that the intercourse was committed on the assurance of arranging job. He further submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 26.08.2025.

6. The application for bail is vehemently opposed by the learned counsel for the informant and the learned APP for the State. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the petitioner has cheated the informant and has taken Rs. 4 lakhs from her for arranging job. It is also submitted that he should be directed to pay the said amount. Learned counsel for the informant has also stated that Rs. 4 lakhs rupees were paid in cash and in account also but he is not having evidence regarding payment of entire Rs. 4 lakhs. He is having statement of bank for certain rupees.

7. Countering this, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is also having the statements which will go to show that he has already paid the



informant more than that amount.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sheikhpura in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No. 70 of 2022.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

