

**IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT AND ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I PURNEA**

**Bail Petition No. 245/2026**

**U/s 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023**

**(Arising out of Srinagar P.S. Case No. 90/2025)**

**IN THE MATTER OF:-**

Sanjeev Kumar, aged about 25 years, S/o Indra Devi Singh

R/o village- Chariya Rahika W/No.11, P.S.- Srinagar & District- Purnea ..... Accused Petitioner  
Vs.

State of Bihar ..... Opposite Party

**25.05.2026**

The bail application has been filed on behalf of the accused petitioner namely Sanjeev Kumar who is in custody since 06.02.2026 in connection with Srinagar P.S Case No. 90/2025 registered for the offences punishable u/s. 69, 127(1), 115(2), 351(2), 352/3(5) of BNS, 2023.

2. The case diary is available with the bail case record. The petitioner in para 2 of the bail application has given a certificate with respect to filing of ABP No. 2072/2025 before the learned Court of Principal District and Sessions Judge, Purnea which was rejected on 22/12/2025 and also filing of ABP before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna which was dismissed as withdrawn.
3. Heard the learned counsel Sri Vishal Kumar appearing on behalf of the petitioner and the **victim** through Sri Rahul Raja, the learned APP appearing on behalf of the opposite party.
4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence of rape upon the victim under deceitful means but the relationship has been established on account of love affair under mutual consent in between the parties and the petitioner has got clean past and has languishing in jail custody since 06.02.2026. On these grounds, it has been prayed for grant of the regular bail to the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the opposite party opposes the prayer of bail submitting that this is a case of forced rape upon the victim by the petitioner.

5. The prosecution case, in short, is that the victim XXX has got an FIR lodged on 13.08.2025 alleging therein that the petitioner lives near her village and he developed friendship with her and wants to solemnize marriage with her and on 16.05.2025, on the pretext of marriage, this petitioner has taken her to Bengalaru and established physical relationship with her with false assurance of marriage with her and thereafter, the petitioner came to his home without giving any information to her and on 28.6.2025, anyhow, the victim arrived the petitioner's house and after seeing her, the petitioner fled away from his house and the family members of the petitioner kept her for some time with assurance that they will solemnise her marriage with the petitioner but later on, family members of this petitioner started abusing and extending threat to her that without fulfillment of cash of Rs.3,00,000/- as dowry, they will not solemnise her marriage with the petitioner and they drove her out from their house on 20.07.2025 at about 5.30 P.M. and hence the FIR.

6. Perused the bail application along with the LCR which appears that the doctor has opined no sexual assault upon the victim at the time of her medical examination and the para 6 of the case diary describes the place of the occurrence and materials collected in the case diary make support of the alleged offence i.e. sexual intercourse upon the victim by the petitioner under deceitful means and the statement of the victim recorded u/s. 180 of BNSS, 2023 and the statement of the victim recorded u/s. 183 of BNSS, 2023 also support about the sexual intercourse upon the victim by the petitioner under deceitful means and the petitioner has refused to solemnise the marriage. On perusal of the LCR, it appears that after completion of the investigation, the investigating officer has filed the charge-sheet finding the case true against the petitioner and accordingly, the cognizance has been taken against the petitioner for the offences punishable u/s. 69, 127 of BNS, 2023. The sexual intercourse upon the victim is without the petitioner's intention of marriage under deceitful means and the petitioner's sole intention appears for seducing the victim to indulge in sexual acts to satisfy his lust and the allegation against the petitioner for committing the sexual intercourse under deceitful means upon the victim is direct.
7. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer of bail made on behalf of the accused petitioner Sanjeev Kumar stands **rejected**. The petitioner may renew his bail application after deposition of victim in trial.

Dictated

sd/-

(Narendra Kumar)

Addl. Sessions Judge-I

**Memo No. .... Dated 26.05.2026**

Copy of order along with LCR is forwarded to the Court of Sri Md. Kamran, learned J.M. 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Purnea in connection with Srinagar P.S. Case No. 90/2025 for information and needful.

(Narendra Kumar)

Addl. Sess. Judge-I

Date of Order	25.05.2026
Date of Reserving Order	
Uploading Date	26.05.2026
Uploaded by	Amit Adarsh, Stenographer