

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43684 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-431 Year-2023 Thana- NAUTAN District- West Champaran

Upendra Chaudhary S/O Bhola Choudhary @ Bhola Chaudhari R/O Village-
Budhwalia, Dakshin Telhua, Ward No 10, P.S. Nautan, District West
Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mukhlal Mukhiya S/O Late Narayan Mukhiya R/O Mangalpur, Gudriya
Ward No 3, P.S. Nautan, District West Champaran

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Nafisu Zzoha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Shyam Bihari Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Manjeet Kumar Mishra, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

4 01-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

APP for the State, learned counsel for the informant and perused

the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Nautan

P.S. Case No. 431 of 2023 instituted for the offences under

Sections 366(A) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 8 of the

POCSO 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 06.05.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 21264 of 2024.



4. In compliance of the order dated 01.07.2025, a report dated 15.07.2025 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that the victim has been examined on 17.10.2024 and out of ten prosecution witnesses, total six prosecution witnesses have been examined. It is further reported that the present stage of the case is fixed for prosecution evidence.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 07.10.2023 without any rhymes or reason and has got no criminal antecedent.

6. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

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 three months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of three months, as



stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer
before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

