

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11448 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-28 Year-2024 Thana- SAHIYARA District- Sitamarhi

Vasir Nadav @ Vasire Aalam @ Nasir Aalam @ Wazire Alam @ Wazir Nadaf
Son of Yunus Nadaf @ Yunas Nadaf @ Yunas Nadal R/o village -
Madheshara @ Ward No.- 9, Madhesra, P.S.- Sonbarsa (Old) @ Bhutahi
(New), Dist.- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. X Son of Radhe Shyam Thakur R/o village - Fulparasi, Ward No.- 13, P.S.-
Sahiyara, Dist.- Sitamarhi.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr. Indihar Kumari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 23-02-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP for the State.

2. This is the 2nd attempt of the petitioner. The
petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sahiyara P.S. Case No.
28 of 2024, registered for the offence under Sections 363, 366
(A), 379, 420, 506 of the Indian Penal Code and u/s 8 of
POCSO Act.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was
rejected on 23.07.2025 in Cr. Misc. No. 15663 of 2025 which
reads as follows:-

*“Heard learned counsel for the
petitioner, learned counsel for the informant*



Shri Amit Kumar and learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Sahiyara P.S. Case No. 28 of 2024 registered for the offence under Sections 363, 366(A), 379, 420, 506 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 8 of the POCSO Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner is accused of establishing relationship with a minor victim by wrongly disclosing his religion and thereafter he took her away and when the girl refused to marry him then he has given her something because of which she fainted and thereafter when she gained her consciousness she was at her parental home.

4. The petitioner is in custody since 15.10.2024.

5. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case as he has not done any sexual act with the victim and therefore he may be granted bail.

6. Learned counsel for the informant has vehemently opposed the application of the petitioner for grant of bail and has submitted that the petitioner had taken away the minor victim after making false promise to her.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

9. If the trial of the petitioner is delayed due to the fault of the prosecution then the petitioner may renew his prayer for



bail.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the trial, charges has been framed.

5. Considering the gravity of offence, this Court finds no ground to review its earlier order. Accordingly, this application for regular bail stands rejected.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

