

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90856 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-99 Year-2025 Thana- KAMTAUL District- Darbhanga

=====

Angaj Choupal @ Angaj Kumar S/O Soman Choupal @ Soman Chaupal R/O
Village- Milki, P.S.- Kamtaul, Post- Chak Tataila, District- Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shree X S/O Late Dhaneshwar Chaupal a

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Manish Chandra Gandhi, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Arun Kumar Pandey, APP
For the O.P. No.2 :	Dr. Koushlendra Narayan, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 26-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

APP for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party

no.2.

2. A prayer for bail has been made on behalf of the
petitioner in connection with Kamtaul P.S. Case no.99 of 2025
registered under sections 126(2), 115(2), 118, 76, 352, 351(2),
324(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 8 and 12 of POCSO
Act.

3. Allegation in the F.I.R is that petitioner is alleged to
have forcibly taken victim by entering into informant's house at
night and attempted to disrobe her with intent to commit rape
and also indulged in assaulting the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on baseless and fabricated allegations of taking away the minor daughter of the informant from her house, attempting to disrobe her and inappropriately touching her. It is further submitted that the petitioner and the informant are neighbours and due to ulterior motive the present F.I.R has been lodged. It is further submitted that two witnesses to the alleged occurrence, namely Lakhan Chaupal and Pramila Devi, have not completely supported the prosecution case during the course of investigation. Additionally, it is submitted that victim refused to undergo medical examination. The injury report of the informant indicates only simple hurt in nature. The petitioner has remained in custody since 09.10.2025 with no criminal antecedent. He undertakes to co-operate in case/trial.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 on the ground that petitioner along with co-accused had subjected the minor daughter of the informant to a form of sexual assault with the threatening of committing rape upon her and the said fact has been supported by the victim in her statement recorded under Section 183 of BNSS.

6. Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts and



circumstances of the case and also considering the statement of the victim, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at present and the application is rejected .

7. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Harsh/-

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

