

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87915 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-31 Year-2025 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Gaya

Baby Ranjan Kumar @ Babi Ranjan S/o Ravindra Kumar @ Ravindra Prasad
@ Ravindra Ram @ Ravinder Kumar R/o Village - Amaw Tola, Dwarika
Kapuri, P.S - Mau, District - Gaya

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. XXX W/o YYY R/o Village - Dwarikapuri, Jaldpur, P.S - Mau, District - Gaya

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Aryan Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Binay Krishna, A.P.P.
For OP No. 2	:	Mr. Ramchandra Singh, Advocate
	:	Mr. Rabindra Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 30-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since
08.08.2025 in connection with Gaya Mahila P.S. Case No. 31 of
2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 70(1) and
351(2) of BNS and Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(1)(w), 3(1)(i),
3(2)(va) of the SC/ST Act and Section 6 of the POCSO Act.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that based
on written information of the informant to the Officer In-charge
alleges therein that on 22.05.2025 at 4.00 P.M. informant's



minor daughter was standing outside her house, opposite to Ravindra Ram's house and on pretext of giving the minor pen and others, the mentioned persons lured the victim inside their house and after threatening to kill the minor, committed wrong act with her. Informant came to know about the occurrence from locals after which informant's daughter described the occurrence to the informant. As only 4 SC/ST houses were in surrounding area, others have even committed wrong with the female.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the allegation as alleged in the FIR is forged and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. It is next submitted that from bare perusal of the FIR it appears that the date of occurrence is 22.05.2025 and the FIR has been instituted on 28.06.2025 i.e., after a delay of more than one month without giving any plausible explanation.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for the informant, on the other hand, have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submit that the victim in her statement recorded under Section 183 of BNSS has fully supported the case of the



prosecution. Apart from that the medical report of the victim suggest that she has been sexually assaulted by the accused persons including the petitioner.

6. Considering the report of the learned Trial Court, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail in connection with Gaya Mahila P.S. Case No. 31 of 2025 pending in the court of learned District and Additional Sessions Judge-VI-cum-Special Judge of POCSO Act, Gaya.

7. Prayer is refused.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

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

