

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11440 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-53 Year-2024 Thana- PUWAKHALI District- Kishanganj

Md. Raja @ Abdul Malik @ Amalik S/o Late Jamil Akthar Resident of
Village- Tellibhitta, Ward no. 7, P.S- Powakhali, Dist- Kishanganj, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. X D/o Y Resident of Village- Tellibhitta, Ward no. 7, P.S- Pawakhali, Dist- Kishanganj, Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Raj Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 11-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, informant
and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Pawakahali P. S. Case No. 53 of 2024 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 376, 504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal
Code and Sections 4/6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual
Offences Act.

3. It is alleged that on pretext of marriage, this
petitioner repeatedly established physical relation with the
informant and thereafter refused to marry and threatened to
make her obscene videos viral, if she disclosed the ordeal to
anyone.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. As a matter of fact, there is land dispute between the parties and petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. Petitioner claims clean antecedent and is in custody since 09.09.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that there is specific accusation against the petitioner that he established physical relation with the informant repeatedly and thereafter refused to marry. Medical report of the victim also supports the allegation as she was found two months' pregnant.

6. Considering the nature of accusation and gravity of the offence, prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

7. However, since petitioner is in custody since 09.09.2025, Trial Court is directed to expedite and conclude the trial, preferably, within a period of one year from the date of receipt/production of copy of this order.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Navya/-

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

