

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8664 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2023 Thana- RATANPUR District- Supaul

Ramashish Mehta, S/o- Sahdev Mehta Village- Narpatpatti Ward No 08, Ps-
Ratanpura Distt- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. XXX (Informant) D/O- Sri Ghanshyam Yadav Resident of Satanpatti
Ward.No-7, PS- Ratanpura Dist- Supaul(Bihar).

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Nidhi, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anand Kishore Choudhary, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

7 14-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Ratanpur
P.S. Case No. 45 of 2023, instituted for the offences under
Sections 376(3) and 506 of the of the Indian Penal Code,
Section 4 of the POCSO Act and Sections 67 and 67-B of the
I.T. Act.

3. Earlier, vide order dated 23.07.2024 passed in Cr.
Misc. No. 29024 of 2024, regular bail of the petitioner was
rejected by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court considering the
direct allegation of committing rape on the victim forcefully on
the gun point and took video of the incident and made the



obscene video viral.

4. In compliance of the order dated 17.02.2026, a report dated 12.03.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that charge has been framed against the petitioner on 20.02.2024. It is further reported that out of 08 prosecution witnesses, 04 prosecution witnesses, including victim, informant and one non-official witnesses and one medical officer have been examined. The report further indicates that the trial of the case will be completed within two-three months.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 14.08.2023 without any rhymes or reason. He further submitted that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case and there is an unexplained delay of about fifteen days in lodging the F.I.R. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that other co-accused has been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 23.07.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 19913 of 2024.

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

7. There is no fresh ground to consider the bail petition



of the petitioner.

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.

(Alok Kumar, J)

manish/-

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

