

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88538 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-207 Year-2024 Thana- SHAMBHUGANJ District- Banka

1. Sourav Kumar Sah @ Sourav Kumar S/O Bhavesh Sah R/O Village- Manjhgany, P.S- Shambhuganj, Distt.- Banka.
2. Gaurav Kumar Sah @ Gaurav Kumar S/O Muneshwar Sah @ Munna Sah R/O Village- Manjhgany, P.S- Shambhuganj, Distt.- Banka.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Md Shahbaz Yusuf

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Choubey Jawahar

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      30-04-2026                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Shambhuganj P.S. Case No.207/2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 354A, 385, 506, of the Indian Penal Code and Section 66(c) of the I.T. Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that Shubham kidnapped her brother and thereafter made a video call on whats-app of the informant on 20.03.2024 and forced her to make a sexual video, further Shubham based on that video, tried extorting an amount of Rs.1 lac from her, on



protest, Shubham threatened to make the video viral, further Shubham shared the video with his friend Prem, thereafter Prem sent the said video to the informant from his mobile number as detailed in the FIR and started forcing her to marry him or else he will get her marriage fixed broken, further Prem got her marriage broken based on the said inappropriate video by sending it her would be husband, it is next alleged that thereafter Shubham, Sourav (petitioner no.1) and Gaurav (petitioner no.2) made the video viral in the whole village.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the thrust of the allegation is against Shubham and Prem and in the last part of the FIR it is alleged that these petitioners were also involved in making the video viral in the whole village. It is further submitted that it absolutely does not stand to reason that as to why the petitioners would have made the video of the informant viral which was already made viral by Prem as alleged in the FIR. It is also submitted that an FIR came to be instituted by petitioner no.1 being Shambhuganj P.S. Case No.201/2024 dated 27.06.2024 against the informant and her



family members alleging that they had assaulted him. It is next submitted that after the FIR was instituted by Sourav, thereafter the informant instituted the instant FIR on 30.06.2024 by way of a counter blast. It is also submitted that the date of occurrence is 20.03.2024 and the FIR came to be instituted on 30.06.2024 i.e. after a delay of 100 days and Rambalak Sharma has been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by an order dated 17.07.2025 in ABP No.859 of 2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-III, Banka.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that inappropriate video of the informant was made viral. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the thrust of the allegation no doubt is against Shubham and Prem but then informant also alleges that petitioners were also involved in making the video viral in the entire village. It is also submitted that there is a delay in instituting the instant FIR but then when it comes to character of a woman, the family is not ready to face the society but then the informant appears to be a bold lady, who instituted the instant FIR. It is further submitted that petitioner no.1 instituted the



aforesaid case against the informant and her family members alleging that they assaulted him. It is thus submitted that since they were involved in the occurrence that may be a reason for informant and her family members to go to the house of petitioner no.1 for confronting him when the occurrence might have taken place. It is also submitted that even marriage of the informant got broken and her entire life stands jeopardized. It is next submitted that the case of Rambalak Sharma is not akin to the case of the petitioners.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioners is rejected.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

amit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

