

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.85275 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-520 Year-2025 Thana- SAHARSA SADAR District- Saharsa

Raju Sharma @ Laddu Sharma S/O Somen Sharma R/O- Bharti Nagar,
Ward no.- 26-35, P.S-Saharsa, Dist.- Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. X X R/O- Bharti Nagar, Ward no.- 26-35, P.S-Saharsa, Dist.- Saharsa

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Binod Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP
For the Informant :	Mr. Munish Kumar, Advocate
	Mr. Munna Raj, Advocate
	Mr. Shitanshu Shekhar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 25-03-2026 Heard Mr. Binod Kumar Sinha, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Munish Kumar, learned counsel for the informant and Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since 24.08.2025 in connection with Saharsa Sadar P.S. Case No. 520 of 2025, F.I.R. dated 02.05.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 77 and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 and Section 08/12 of the POCSO Act.

3. According to prosecution case, this petitioner has made an obscene video of the informant's minor daughter while she was bathing and threatened them to pay Rs. 1 lakh or else he



would viral the said video. It is further alleged that when the family members of the victim tried to snatch his phone then all the accused persons including this petitioner abused and assaulted them.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. The allegation as alleged in the FIR is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. He further submits that it appears from the FIR that the date of occurrence is 21.04.2025 but the present FIR has been instituted on 02.05.2025 i.e., after delay of 10 days without giving any explanation of the said delay.

5. The learned counsel for the informant as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the statement of the victim was recorded in which the victim has fully supported the case of the prosecution and apart from that the mobile phone of the petitioner was examined by the expert team and it has been found that the video of the victim was present in his mobile phone which was recorded in paragraph no. 42 of the case diary and the date of birth of the victim is



01.01.2008 which suggest that at the time of occurrence she was minor.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail in connection with Saharsa Sadar P.S. Case No. 520 of 2025 pending in the court of learned Additional District Judge-VI-cum-Special Judge, POCSO, Saharsa.

7. Prayer is refused.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Vanisha/-

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

