

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47943 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-31 Year-2024 Thana- NTPC District- Bhagalpur

=====

Ankit Kumar S/o Sriram Yadav R/vill- Ward no 11, Jamuniya Tola Lodipur
Bhader, P.S.- NTPC Kahalgaon, Dist- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sunita Devi W/o Arun Yadav R/o Vill- Jamuniya Tola, Post- Lalapur Bhader,
P.S.- N.T.P.C. Kahalgaon, Distt- Bhagalpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajive Ranjan Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Priya Sharan Singh, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 11-07-2025 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 Special
Case (POCSO) No. 211 of 2024, arising out of N.T.P.C. P.S.
Case No. 31 of 2024, instituted for the offences punishable
under Section 65(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 read
with Section 04 of POCSO Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, the petitioner
has committed rape upon minor daughter of the informant.

4. The petitioner has renewed his prayer for grant of
bail which was earlier rejected by this Court on merit vide order



dated 21.03.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 85690 of 2024.

5. From perusal of the impugned order, it appears that the charge has been framed against the petitioner under Section 65(1) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 4 of the Protection of Child from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 on 29.01.2025 and the case is pending for prosecution evidence since 18.02.2025 but, not a single prosecution witness has been produced till date.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. The petitioner is in custody since 29.09.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent. He further submits that the charge-sheet has been submitted and the charge has also been framed against the petitioner but, till date, no a single witness has been examined and, thus, there is no likelihood of the conclusion of the trial in near future. He further submits that the victim of the present case has been examined but, has not supported the prosecution case.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court does not find any new/fresh ground for re-considering the prayer for grant of bail of the petitioner. The trial is already in progress.



8. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is again rejected with a direction to the learned court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

