

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10272 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-122 Year-2024 Thana- DURAULI District- Siwan

=====

Suraj Chauhan S/o Kedar Chauhan Resident of Village- Piparahiyan, P.S.-
Darauli, District- Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Pinki Devi W/o Ramu Chauhan Resident of Village- Piparahiyan, P.S.-
Darauli, District- Siwan

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 03-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S.T.
No. 445 of 2024, arising out of Darauli P.S. Case No. 122 of
2024 instituted for the offences under Sections 342, 323, 376,
379 & 504 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. 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 on merit by this Court vide order



dated 24.02.2025, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 83373 of 2024, taking into account the Section 164 Cr.P.C. statement of the victim.

4. In compliance of the order dated 13.02.2026 a report dated 26.03.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that out of eight prosecution witnesses, no witnesses have been examined till date.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 02.05.2024 without any rhymes or reason, having no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no likelihood of the trial being concluded in the near future, hence, petitioner may be enlarged on bail.

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

7. There is no new 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. If the trial is not concluded within the period of six months, as stated



above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before
the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

