

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10662 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-88 Year-2024 Thana- KRISHNAGARH District- Bhojpur

Bhollu Miyan S/o Mohammad Anaras Rayeen @ Mohammad Anaras Miyan
@ Ansu Miyan Resident of Village - Gundi, P.S - Krishnagarh (Barhara),
District - Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Kusum Devi W/o Om Prakash Vishwakarma R/o Village - Gundi, P.s -
Krishnagarh (Barhara), District - Bhojpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ram Naresh Ray, APP
For the Informant	:	None

**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. None appears on behalf of the informant
despite notice being validly served.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Krishnagarh P.S. Case No. 88 of 2024 instituted for the offences
under Sections 65(2), 351(2), 61(2), 191(2), 249(A) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 4/6 of the POCSO
Act.

3. Earlier vide order dated 03.04.2025 passed in Cr.
Misc. No. 752 of 2025, regular bail of the petitioner was



rejected by this Court considering the Statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS as also the nature and gravity of offence.

4. In compliance of the order dated 13.02.2026 a report dated 23.2.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that all the six witnesses have been examined. It is further reported that trial is likely to be concluded in two months.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 19.08.2024 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 the verge of conclusion.

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 two months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of two 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	
---	--	---	--

