

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6819 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8 Year-2025 Thana- MAHILA P.S District- West Champaran

Dhamu Sah Son of Mithan Sah @ Mithun Sah R/o Village - Bishunpura,
Ward 02, Post - Kathaiya, P.S. - Jagdishpur, District - West Champaran, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. X W/o Girish Prasad The Officer-in-charge, Bettiah Mahila P.S., P.S. - Bettiah Town, Dist. - West Champaran, Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Choubey Jawahar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

6 15-05-2026 Heard Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr. Choubey Jawahar, learned APP for the State.

2. Mr. Choubey Jawahar, learned APP for the State
submits that he has already informed the Opposite Party No. 2
regarding filing of the present case.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bettiah
Mahila P.S. Case No. 08 of 2025, instituted for the offences
under Sections 64, 65(1), 143(1), 145, 98, 3(5) of the Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, read with Sections 6, 8, 12 of POCSO
Act, Sections 75, 79 of J.J. Act, Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 of I.T. Act,
Sections 16, 17 and 18 of the Bounded Labour System Act.



4. 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 by this Court vide order dated 13.08.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 30093 of 2025 taking into consideration the nature of accusation, gravity of the offence and involvement of the petitioner in the offence.

5. In compliance of the order dated 30.01.2026, a report dated 12.02.2026 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 and out of nineteen prosecution witnesses, only two witnesses have been examined in this case. It is further reported that the trial is likely to be concluded within a period of nine months.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 23.02.2025 without any rhymes or reason and has got no criminal antecedent.

7. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

8. 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.



9. 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. If the trial is not concluded within the period of six months, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

