

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42179 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-3 Year-2024 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Rohtas

Abdul Hayat Ansari S/O Siddique Ansari @Sadik Ansari Resident of Village
Bandhpa, P.O Chanp, P.S. Akorhi Gola, District Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sujit Kumar Son Of Shiv Shankar Prasad R/V- Village- Akorhigola,
(Subhash Nagar Kali Mandir), P.S.- Akorhigola, Distt.- Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shashi Kant, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Kalyan Shankar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Chandan Kumar Verma, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

5 04-12-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State as also learned counsel for the Informant. Perused
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Mahila
(Dehri) P.S. Case No. 03 of 2024 instituted for the offence under
Sections 354(A), 354(B), 354(D) & 509 of the Indian Penal
Code and Section 10 of the POCSO Act.

3. As per prosecution case, allegation against the
petitioner is of outraging the modesty of the daughter of the
informant by touching her private parts with sexual intentions.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner
that the petitioner is in custody since 11-03-2024. Petitioner is a



man of clean antecedent.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that no such occurrence as alleged in the FIR ever took place. Victim girl has refused for her medical examination. It is submitted that charge sheet has already been submitted in this case.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the Informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the Informant submits that all the witnesses have been examined in this case and there is direct allegation against the petitioner which is serious in nature, hence, petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

7. A report was called from the Trial Court and it is reported that out of seven charge sheet witnesses six witnesses have been examined and only one witness is yet to be examined. It is further reported that trial is likely to be concluded within a period of two months.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and specifically taking into account the report of the trial court, wherein it is stated that only one witness out of seven charge sheet witnesses is yet to be examined and trial is likely to



be concluded within a period of two months, accordingly, this Court, at this stage, is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer is *rejected*.

8. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

