

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8304 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-221 Year-2024 Thana- BYPASS District- Patna

Jitendra Kumar S/O Late Raghunath Prasad Mehta R/O Village - Bahari
Dhawalpura, Imli Tola P.S- Bypass, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. XXX S/O Dev Narayan Mahto R/O Village - Dhawalpura, P.S- Bypass,
Distt.- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Khushi Awadh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nityanand Tiwary, A.P.P.

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

ORAL ORDER

5 08-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Spl.
(POCSO) Case No.- 145 of 2024 arising out of By Pass P.S.
Case No. 221 of 2024 instituted for the offences under Sections
420, 376, and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 4
of the POCSO Act.

3. Earlier vide order dated 07.04.2025 passed in Cr.
Misc. No. 1215 of 2025, regular bail of the petitioner was
rejected by this Court considering the nature and gravity of the
offence as also taking into account the statement of the victim
girl recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C with a direction to the



court below to expedite the trial and the conclude the same expeditiously.

4. In compliance of the order dated 03.02.2026, a report dated 09.03.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that charge was framed on against the petitioner on 06.06.2025. It is further reported that out of five witnesses named in the charge sheet, three witnesses have been examined including the father of the victim, mother of the victim and one independent witness. The trial would be completed within a period of four months.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 31.05.2024 without any rhymes or reason.

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. 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 four months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of four months, as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/Sukriti

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

