

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.802 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-688 Year-2024 Thana- DAUDNAGAR District- Aurangabad

Prince Kumar Son of Late Sidheshwar Yadav @ Late Sudev yadav Resident
of village- Chauri, Ward No. 07,P.S.- Daudnagar, District- Aurangabad

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Durga Choudhary Son of Munarik Choudhary Resident of village- Chauri,
Ward No. 08,P.S.- Daudnagar, District- Aurangabad

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :
For the Appellant/s : Mr. Binod Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Binay Krishna, SPP
For the Respondent No.2: None

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

ORAL ORDER

517-07-2026

Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned
Special Public Prosecutor for the State. None appears on behalf
of the informant despite notice being validly served.

2. The instant appeal has been filed by the appellant against the order dated 22.01.2026 passed by learned ADJ-1st cum Special Judge, SC/ST, NDPS and Children Act whereby the prayer for bail of the appellant in connection with Daudnagar P.S. Case No. 688 of 2024 under Sections 103(1), 238(a) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, Section 27 of the Arms Act and



Sections 3(2)(v) of the SC/ST Act was rejected.

3. Earlier, vide order dated 31.07.2025 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 2137 of 2025, regular bail of the appellant was rejected by this Court considering the material available against the appellant in the case diary.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is languishing in judicial custody since 30.10.2024 without any rhymes or reason and has two criminal antecedents.

5. Learned SPP for the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail.

6. In compliance of the order dated 08.05.2026 a report dated 23.06.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that there are eight charge-sheeted witnesses and out of them seven have been examined.

7. There is no fresh ground to consider the bail petition of the appellant.

8. In view of the above, the prayer for bail of the appellant is again rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of three months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of three months, as



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

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

