

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31343 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-99 Year-2022 Thana- MAKHDUMPUR District- Jehanabad

Sanjay Kumar @ Santosh Kumar S/o- Surendra Singh @ Canteen Mishra
Village- Pandau Near Bus Stand PS- and District-Madhubani, A/P- Nalapar
Rajapur House of Suresh Singh Ps- Budha Colony Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Gulshan Khatun W/o- Md. Kaishar Ansari Mauja- Saren Ps- Makhdumpur
OP Tehta Dist- Jehanabad

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4 22-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Special
POCSO Case No. 43 of 2023, arising out of Makhdumpur P.S.
Case No. 99 of 2022 instituted for the offences under Sections
363, 366A, 376(iii), 376, 372, 373, 370(iii), 370, 467, 468, 471,
420 & 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 4, 6, 8 &
10 of the POCSO Act and Sections 8 & 9 of the Immoral
Trafficking Act.

3. This is the second attempt of the petitioner for bail.
The petitioner has renewed his prayer for grant of regular bail
which was earlier rejected on merit by this Court vide order



dated 13-03-2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 73214 of 2023.

4. In compliance of the order dated 09-07-2025, a report dated 31-07-2025, with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that charge in this case is framed. It is further reported that three out of ten prosecution witnesses have been examined.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 19-05-2023 without any rhymes or reason, having no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that there is no likelihood of the trial being concluded in the near future.

6. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail.

7. There is no new ground to consider the bail petition of the petitioner. From the aforesaid report, it appears that the trial is going on and is at an advance stage.

8. In view of the above, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is again *rejected* with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of six months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of six months, as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before



the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

