

**The Court of District and Additional Sessions Judge-I, Cum Special Judge SC/ST (P.O.A) Act, Buxar
(Presiding Officer :- Uday Pratap Singh)**

A.B.P. No. 198/2026

Arising out of Buxar (Town) PS case no. 665/2025

1. Rana Pratap Singh @ Ram Pratap Singh aged about 32 years S/o- Premjit Singh R/o village Majhariya, P.S. Buxar (I), Distt. Buxar.**Petitioner.**

Versus

The State of Bihar

....**Respondent.**

Appearance :- For the petitioner:- Sri Arun Kumar Rai, Ld. Advocate

For the State:- Sri Kedar Nath Tiwari, Ld. P.P.

Order dated: 07.03.2026

1. This anticipatory bail petition has been filed in connection with Buxar (Town) PS case no. 665/2025 registered under Sections 69 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita-2023. Hence, petitioner is apprehending from his arrest. Copy of bail petition has already been served to Ld. P.P
2. Learned counsel appeared on behalf of the petitioner and submitted that earlier no other bail petition has been filed, decided or pending in any other court. The petitioner is innocent and he did not commit any offence. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in present case. The allegation made in the F.I.R is concocted, frivolous and baseless. The petitioner has clean antecedent. No any case is made out against the petitioner. As per section 69 of B.N.S. the petitioner has never established any physical relation with the informant. The informant has falsely implicated the petitioner only with intention to grab money. The petitioner is an advocate in Buxar Civil Court and the informant used to come in the Court, other than this the petitioner has no concern with the informant. The petitioner is ready to co-operate in investigation and he shall make himself available for interrogation by investigation officer as and when required. The petitioner shall not interfere in prosecution evidence in any form. In case of granting bail, the petitioner shall abide by all the terms and conditions imposed by the Court. It is lastly submitted in para no. 10 of his petition that the Hon'ble High Court, Prayagraj has held on 30.01.2026 in Jitendra Kumar Vs.Utter Pradesh that if any physical relation is made with the consent of both and both are adult, then it will not be an offence under section 69 of the B.N.S. The learned counsel also cited Naim Ahamed Vs. State (NCT of Delhi) reported in 2023 (1) PLJR 416 (SC). Hence, it is prayed that the petitioner deserves bail.

3. On issuing of notice, the informant herself appeared before this Court and described her ordeal in details including her diminished reputation everywhere. Learned P.P. also vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner stating that a very wrong message would be passed in the society if the bail of the petitioner is considered in this manner and then refused to marry and he is abusing and intimating also.
4. The prosecution case in brief is that the informant Puja Kumari submitted a written application before S.H.O. of Buxar (T) police station in which it is alleged that Rana Pratap Singh (Petitioner) deceived her and made physical relation on the pretext of false promise of marriage.
5. Heard both sides. Case diary has been received. Record reveals that the petitioner is sole accused in the FIR. There is allegation against the petitioner that he established physical relation with the informant/victim on the assurance of false promise of marriage and when the informant asked to solemnize the marriage then the petitioner refused for marriage with the victim/informant and started abusing and threatening her. The petitioner is unmarried and the informant is a divorcee and it has been informed by both the sides that they belong to same caste also and thus there is no impediment in their marriage. This Court tried its best for the same and also referred the matter to mediation center but the mediation failed. The informant herself who is present in the Court room has stated that the mediation failed on account of stubborn attitude of the petitioner, although the mediators also tried for the same. The informant is admittedly Ld. advocate of this Court. She has reiterated the prosecution version in para no. 16 and para no. 47 of the case diary under section 180 and 183 of B.N.S.S. respectively. Khushboo Kumari, sister of the informant in para no. 22 of the case diary and Usha Devi, mother of the informant in para no. 23 of the case diary have stated that the petitioner is regular visitor of their house and he used to take her to Vindhyachal and Varanasi after their permission on the pretext of marriage and made physical relation repeatedly during the tour after hiring room in hotels on that belief. It has been alleged that she became pregnant in the month of June 2025 and abortion pills were administered against her will and one month of pregnancy was terminated. It has also been alleged that the marriage was solemnized between them on 16th May 2025 at Barmeshwar Nath Mandir. Three audio clips contained in Pen drive reveal the conversation regarding permission of mother to take informant on tour and future planning after marriage like purchase of car and construction of matrimonial home etc as evident in para no. 54 of the case diary. The case has been found true during supervision by S.D.P.O, Buxar as is evident from para no. 51 of the case diary. From the C.D.R./S.D.R. of the mobile phone of the informant and the petitioner it is found that there has been 207 times conversation between them from 04.06.2025 to 12.01.2026 as is evident in para no. 113 and 114 of the case diary. The case law referred by the petitioner i.e Naim

Ahamed Vs. State (NCT of Delhi) reported in 2023 (1) PLJR 416 (SC) appears to be not applicable in the present set of circumstances as the prosecutrix in that case happens to be a married women but she is a divorcee in the case in hand. It is important to mention here that there has not been any specific section in the I.P.C. for the alleged offence. But, the Indian Parliament in its wisdom has enacted separate section 69 in B.N.S. to curb the growing tendency of this menace triable by the Court of Sessions with imprisonment which may extend to 10 years and shall also be liable to fine. The investigation is still going on.

6. Having heard the rival contention of both the parties and considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, this court is of view that witnesses in case diary are supporting the prosecution case, offence is of very serious in nature. Hence, at this stage, granting of privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is not justifiable. Accordingly without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner namely **Rana Pratap Singh @ Ram Pratap Singh** is here by **rejected**.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

1st Addl. Sessions Judge cum

Special Judge under SC/ST (POA) Act, Buxar.

Order of order	07.03.2026
Date of uploading	07.03.2026
Uploaded by	Ratnesh Kumar Singh, Stenographer.