

IN THE COURT OF SRI RAJ NARAYAN NIGAM, DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE- I,
BHAGALPUR

Bail Petition No. 640/2026
(Arising out of Bath P.S. Case No 49/2026)
U/s 69, 351(2) of BNS & 66(E) of IT Act.
Aman Kumar versus The State of Bihar

Aman Kumar, aged about 27 years, S/o Sunil Ray,
R/o village- Faradah, PS-Safiya Sarai, District- Munger.

Petitioner

versus

The State of Bihar

Opposite Party

For the Petitioner : Sri. Biresb Pd. Mishra, Ld Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Vijay Kumar Singh, Ld Additional PP.
For the Informant : Sri. Ajeet Kumar Pandey, Ld Advocate.

Date of order or proceeding	Order with signature of the court	Office action taken with date
1	2	3
24-07-2026	The accused-petitioner Aman Kumar who is in custody since 11-05-2026 has filed this bail petition in connection with Bath P.S. Case No 49/2026 registered under Sections 69, 351(2) of BNS & 66(E) of IT Act. On behalf of the petitioner a certificate has been given in para 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner had not filed any bail petition in any form on previous occasion either in the court of Learned Sessions Judge, Bhagalpur or before the Hon'ble High Court Patna. Further, the petitioner has no criminal antecedent as per para 3 of the bail petition. The prosecution case as per written application of the informant Gopal Kumar in brief, is that I respectfully submit that his eldest daughter, Sakshi Kumari used to reside in Bhagalpur for her studies. During the course of her studies, Aman Kumar, who had relatives in informant's village Naya Gaon, frequently visited Naya Gaon and somehow, both of them came into contact via mobile phone. On 31-03-26, Aman Kumar came to his relative's place in Naya Gaon and in a well-planned manner, deceitfully promised marriage to her daughter, exploited her physically, and took explicit photos and videos of her to keep for blackmailing purposes. Meanwhile, they got to know that the boy is already married and is a father of two children and out of fear of social stigma and her daughter did not reveal this matter to anyone. Aman Kumar repeatedly blackmailed her for making physical relations and upon her refusal, he began circulating her photos and videos on social media. When informant tried to ask him the reason then Aman Kumar threatened them for dire consequences due to which her daughter has been deeply traumatized and entire family lives in panic/terror. Hence, the instant FIR. The Learned counsel on behalf of the petitioner submitted that he is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case due to dirty village politics. He further submitted that there is no explanation regarding delay mentioned in FIR. He further submitted that no any offence is made out by the petitioner U/s 69 BNS and there is no any video footage against the petitioner.	

IN THE COURT OF SRI RAJ NARAYAN NIGAM, DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE- I,
BHAGALPUR

Bail Petition No. 640/2026
(Arising out of Bath P.S. Case No 49/2026)
U/s 69, 351(2) of BNS & 66(E) of IT Act.
Aman Kumar versus The State of Bihar

24-07-2026 Contd.P/2	He further submitted that petitioner is in judicial custody since 11-05-2026. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the state duly assisted by Ld. Counsel on behalf of informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail. Heard both sides and perused the case diary. Petitioner is named in FIR. Para-08 of the case diary is re-statement of informant who reiterated the prosecution case. Para 09 and 10 of the case dairy are the statements of witnesses who have supported the prosecution case. Para 14 of the case dairy reveals that a pen drive has been submitted U/s 63 of Bhartiya Sakshya Adhiniyam. On perusal of pen drive there was nude video and several chats were found. Para 34 of the case diary is the statement of victim recorded u/s 183 BNSS wherein the victim alleged that Aman Kumar (petitioner) has called her, mixed some intoxicating substance in her food and also gave her some medicine and took her to hotel room in Bhagalpur and thereafter she did not remember anything. When victim regained her consciousness and asked petitioner he assaulted her and also threatened her to make her objectionable video viral. She further stated that Aman Kumar had also sent objectionable video to her father. Further, Charge-sheet has also been submitted against this petitioner U/s 69, 351(2) of BNS & 66(E) of IT Act. There is direct allegation against the petitioner. Victim also appeared before the court and stated that petitioner has some objectionable video of her and he is threatening her to make the video viral. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegations made against the petitioner, gravity of offence and the fact that there is direction allegation against this petitioner, this court is of the opinion that the petitioner is not entitled to grant of bail. Hence, this Bail Application is Rejected. SD/- District & Additional Sessions Judge I, Bhagalpur.	