

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2540 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1435 Year-2025 Thana- Cyber P.S. District- Patna

=====

Deepak Kumar, Son of Late Raj Kumar Prasad, R/o Village - Sherpur Majholiya, P.S. - Muzaffarpur, Distt. - Patna, at present R/o Manjhi Indian Bank, Chhapra, P.S. - Manjhi, Dist. - Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dhananjay Kumar Tiwary, Adv.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Chandan Kumar Ray, Adv.
		Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the State	:	Dr. Ajeet Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 26-02-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the informant. The State has been represented by the learned Addl. Public Prosecutor.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his/her arrest in connection with Cyber P.S. Case No. 1435 of 2025 registered for the offence(s) under Section(s) 351(B)m 79, 77 and 78 of the of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (B.N.S.) and Sections



66(C), 66(E) and 67 of the I.T. Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has alleged that the petitioner had abused and coerced her and her family members through different mobile numbers in order to pressurize her to solemnize marriage with him. It has been alleged that when the informant, after knowing that the petitioner is already married, stopped talking to him, whereafter the petitioner started harassing her and also posted her compromising photographs on various social media platforms. It has further been alleged that the petitioner also hired muscleman in order to threaten the family of the informant and also assaulted her brother and a similar complaint has also been lodged by the family of the informant against the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It has been submitted that the incident took place in April, 2025, whereas the written report as regards the same has been lodged on 17.06.2025, after a delay of about two months. It has further been submitted that there are contradictions in the earlier complaint lodged by the mother of the informant and the present case. It has next been submitted that the informant is in habit of filing false and frivolous cases against targeted bank employees



with similar allegations. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent except one filed by the mother of the informant, viz., Samastipur Town P.S. Case No. 164 of 2025.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State as also the learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and have submitted that the petitioner, on false pretext of marriage, established physical relationship with the informant and captured her objectionable photographs and videos. It has further been submitted that when the petitioner began defaming the informant in society, she filed an informatory petition before the S.D.M., Samastipur on 03.06.2024. It has, thus, been submitted that the petitioner, in view of his exploitative conduct with the informant, does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and taking note of the fact that the informant had lodged cases earlier against other person also, who also happened to be the bank officials, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. Let the petitioner, above-named, be released on



anticipatory bail, in the event of his/her arrest or surrender before the concerned Court/successor Court within a period of four weeks from today, on his/her furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the concerned Court/successor Court where the case is pending in connection with Cyber P.S. Case No. 1435 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 read with corresponding Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (B.N.S.S.) as well as subject to the following conditions :

(i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his/her close relative and the other shall be a local resident.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present before the concerned Court on each and every date of the trial and shall cooperate in the investigation.

(iii) In case of absence for two consecutive occasions or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bonds of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the concerned Court.

(iv) If the petitioner, in future, is found to be involved in similar nature of offence(s), the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of his/her bail bonds.

(v) The concerned Court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case, at any stage, it is found that he/she has concealed his/her criminal antecedents, the Court concerned shall take necessary



steps for cancellation of his/her bail bond. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

8. It is made clear that the observations, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

9. The application stands allowed.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Praveen-II/-

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

