

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14223 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-652 Year-2025 Thana- SITAMARHI District- Sitamarhi

Parmeshwar Sah S/o- Late Pachkauri Sah @ Pachikauri Sah R/v- Bhasar
Machhaha Ps- Sitamarhi Dist- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Meena Devi w/o- Late Rambali Sah R/v- Bhasar Machhaha, Sahu Tola,
W.No-11, Ps- Sitamarhi Dist- Sitamarhi

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Madhubala Verma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Murlidhar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Devendra Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEEN KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 20-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the Opposite Party No.2 and learned APP for the
State.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for
grant of regular bail in connection with Sitamarhi P.S. Case No.
652 of 2025 dated 28.09.2025 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 65 of B.N.S. and Section 4/6 of
POCSO Act.

3. As per the allegation, this petitioner is alleged to
have committed rape upon the victim girl, who is stated to be
nine years old.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted



that there is a delay of five days in lodging of the FIR. There is no signature of the informant on the formal FIR and the allegation is in the backdrop of Panchayat Election. It has further been submitted that the medical evidence does not support the allegation of rape. The petitioner is in custody since 29.09.2025 having one criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the Opposite Party No.2 have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and has submitted that the victim is aged only nine years old and the allegation is with respect to Sections 4 and 6 of the POCSO Act. Learned counsel for the Opposite Party No.2 has further submitted that charges in this case have been framed and one witness has been examined during the trial.

6. Perused the records and considered the submission of the parties, this Court is not inclined to accede to the prayer for bail of the petitioner and is accordingly dismissed.

(Praveen Kumar, J)

shivam/-

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

