

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 6488 of 2021

Ravi Singh @ Ravi Shankar Prasad Singh	...	
	Versus	
The State of Jharkhand	...	Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate
	: Md. Abdul Wahab, Advocate
For the State	: Mrs. Shweta Singh, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 09.09.2021

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner personally undertakes to remove the defects as pointed out by the stamp reporter within two weeks after the lockdown period is over.

In view of the personal undertaking of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter are ignored for the present.

Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail in connection with Ghaghra (Mahila) P.S. Case No.13 of 2021 registered under sections 376/342/323/307/379/504/506 of the Indian Penal Code.

The Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner has committed rape upon the victim after taking her to his house on the pretext of providing her work in a "web series" and even though the informant victim protested, still the petitioner committed rape with her thrice and it is also alleged that later the petitioner tried to burn the victim by pouring diesel and setting fire after putting her in a room. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false. It is next submitted that that the wife of the petitioner assaulted the victim on the next morning of the occurrence and locked her in a room and physically tortured her goes to show that the relationship between the petitioner and the informant is

consensual. It is further submitted that the petitioner took the victim who is an employee of HBD Finance and she offered to help the petitioner in procuring loan for expanding his wholesale dealership of medicine; for physical verification of the collateral security and the informant demanded Rs.50,000/- from the petitioner for getting the loan sanctioned which was refused by the petitioner, hence this false case has been foisted against the petitioner. It is therefore submitted that the petitioner be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that there is direct allegation against the petitioner of committing rape upon the victim and the victim in her statement recorded under section 164 Cr.P.C. has also supported the case of the prosecution, therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner as well as the requirement of his custodial interrogation during the investigation of the case, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the above named petitioner be given the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail of the above named petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Sonu/Gunjan-