

Ms. Namita Singh, Add. Sess. Judge-I, Biharsharif, Nalanda.
B.P no. 791 of 2026
[arising from Noorsarai P.S. Case No. 194/26
Ravikant Kumar vs State of Bihar

<i>Date of order of proceeding</i>	<i>Order with the signature of the court</i>	<i>Office action taken with date</i>
16.06.2026	This is a regular bail application filed on behalf of the petitioner, Ravikant Kumar, who is currently in judicial custody since 02.04.2026 in connection with Noorsarai P.S. Case No. 194/26, registered u/s 74, 75, 76, 115(2), 126(2), 70(1), 62, 3(5) of the BNS and u/s 67 and 67(A) of IT Act. Shri Brij Nandan Prasad, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that no other bail application, either regular or anticipatory, has been filed by this petitioner either before this court or before Hon'ble High Court. It was stated that the petitioner has a clean antecedent. He is in judicial custody since 02.04.2026. The petitioner has not committed any offence and has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is a student of Radiology in Bhagan Bigha. It is further argued that other co-accused persons, including Munna Pandey, have already been granted bail vide B.P. No. 692 of 2026, and the case of the present petitioner stands on same footing. The learned counsel contends that since the investigation has already concluded with the submission of Charge Sheet No. 17/26 on 11.05.2026, the petitioner, who has been in	

Ms. Namita Singh, Add. Sess. Judge-I, Bihar Sharif, Nalanda.
B.P no. 791 of 2026
[arising from Noorsarai P.S. Case No. 194/26
Ravikant Kumar vs State of Bihar

conti. 16.06.2026	custody since 02nd April 2026, is entitled to identical relief. The learned Public Prosecutor (PP) on behalf of the State strongly opposed the prayer for bail and stated that the accused petitioner has been named as the primary perpetrator in the FIR lodged by the victim woman. The allegations involve a pre-planned, coordinated and brutal physical and sexual assault on a woman in a public space, aimed at molesting her publicly while ensuring that the entire degradation and humiliation was recorded and then widely circulated also. This is not just crime against an individual but an absolute offence against public conscience and social safety. The defence contention seeking parity with other co-accused who have been granted bail is completely untenable, as those accused were neither named in FIR nor was any active role assigned to them subsequently during investigation. Given the audacity of the offence committed and the fact that the accused petitioner is a local co-villager of the victim, there is a well founded apprehension that once released on bail, he will use his position to intimidate the victim and tamper with prosecution witnesses, thereby jeopardizing a fair trial. Heard both sides and perused the record. The prosecution case is based on a written report	
------------------------------------	---	--

Ms. Namita Singh, Add. Sess. Judge-I, Bihar Sharif, Nalanda.
B.P no. 791 of 2026
[arising from Noorsarai P.S. Case No. 194/26
Ravikant Kumar vs State of Bihar

conti. 16.06.2026	filed by Priyanka Kumari, alleging therein that on 26.03.2026 between 6 to 7pm, she had gone to get somethings from the shop of co-villager Ghanshyam Kumar where some other co-villagers – Ashok Yadav, Matalu Mahato, Ravikant Kumar caught hold of her. They threw her on the ground in order to commit rape upon her. Matalu Mahto grabbed her chest and started forcing himself upon her causing injury to her and partially disrobing her. Ravikant Kumar unfastened her petticoat and tried to rape her. Ashok Yadav was with him. A large number of villagers gathered on hearing the shouts and she was saved. A perusal of the Case Diary discloses a deeply disturbing incident wherein a young woman was cornered grouped, molested and an attempt was made to forcefully strip and rape her in full public view, with the entire humiliation and degradation being recorded and later circulated. The FIR specifically named certain individuals as having actively participated in the horrific occurrence, which includes this petitioner against whom there is a direct and specific allegation in the FIR that he unfastened the informant's petticoat. Further, a perusal of para 124 of Case Diary reveals that this petitioner has also been identified later in the video footage by the informant wherein he is seen removing her hands away from her chest to	
--	--	--

Ms. Namita Singh, Add. Sess. Judge-I, Biharsharif, Nalanda.
B.P no. 791 of 2026
[arising from Noorsarai P.S. Case No. 194/26
Ravikant Kumar vs State of Bihar

conti.
16.06.2026

restrict her from defending herself and pushing her ahead. His plea for parity with other co-accused who were earlier granted bail is entirely groundless as the co-accused who have been granted bail are not named in the FIR and were only part of the chaotic crowd engaged in shouting or heckling, whereas this petitioner's action constitute the core of the physical and sexual assault.

Considering the extreme gravity, the heinous nature of the allegations and the clear specific role attributed to this petitioner, I am not inclined to grant him bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail on behalf of the petitioner is hereby **rejected**.

Let a copy of this order be transmitted to the learned court concerned forthwith.

Sd/-
(Namita Singh)
Add. Sess. Judge -I
Biharsharif, Nalanda

Date of Judgment/Order	16.06.2026
Date of Reserving Judgment/Order	-
Date of Uploading	18.06.2026
Uploaded by	Kumar Shivam

Memo No.____, Dated:-_____.

Copy of order forwarded to the Court of Ld. C.J.M Nalanda at Biharsharif for information and needful.

Addl. Sessions Judge-I
Nalanda at Biharsharif